

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, December 19, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We would approach Thee, Almighty God, in the spirit of Him who taught us when we pray to say—

"Our Father who art in heaven. Hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen."

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I present the river and harbor bill, which, together with the accompanying report (No. 1230), I ask be referred under the rule. I would like also to say that I propose to call this bill up at the earliest possible moment. I do not expect, however, according to information I have received, to get it up until after the holidays. But I present it thus early that the membership of the House may have every opportunity of scrutinizing it before it is taken up for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 20189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order.

The bill, with the accompanying report, was ordered printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 6867. An act to increase and fix the compensation of the collector of customs for the customs collection district of Omaha.

HELEN L. BREMNER.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman sends up a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 406 (H. Rept. 1232).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Helen L. Bremner, clerk to Robert Gunn Bremner, late a Representative from the State of New Jersey, compensation at the rate of \$125 per month from and after the date of the death of the said Robert Gunn Bremner until his successor is elected and qualified.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Strike out all of the resolution after the word "Jersey," in line 5, and insert the following: "the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is different from any resolution that has come from the Committee on Accounts, so far as I know, and it is intended to serve somewhat as a precedent for action hereafter. If the House sees fit to pass this resolution, this committee will consider such resolutions hereafter.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this proposes to pay for services that were not rendered during the lifetime of a Member. This lady was a clerk of a Member, and she was to receive \$125 a month. The usual custom, that with which I am familiar in such cases, is to pay the amount up to the date of the death of the Member. Is not that correct? This is to pay a full month's salary, regardless of the fact of whether the Member died at the end of the month or in the middle of the month.

Mr. LLOYD. If this resolution is adopted, the individual is paid \$125 additional to anything she would receive. She would receive pay up to the date of the death of the Member at the rate of \$125 a month.

Mr. BARTLETT. So that this is a mere gratuity?

Mr. LLOYD. Of \$125.

Mr. BARTLETT. Of \$125.

Mr. MANN. It is not a gratuity.

Mr. LLOYD. I beg your pardon. I am accepting your term, but I do not think you mean the word "gratuity" exactly, because a private secretary must stay here and do some work after the death of the Member; and many of the secretaries are expected to stay here sometimes for a month, or even three months.

Mr. BARTLETT. I remember a case when I was a member of the Committee on Accounts, of which committee I was a member for 16 years, which appealed to us very much, where a Member died and his successor was not elected, and the secretary, who was a lady, stayed here and attended to all the correspondence and things of that sort; but we were not able at that time to bring ourselves to the conclusion that it was anything more than a—if it is offensive to say "gratuity," I will say "payment"—a payment not authorized by law or custom of the House. It is, in fact, a gratuity, so far as we are concerned. A Member of Congress receives \$125 a month for the purpose of paying for clerical services. There have been numerous instances of where Members have died and their secretaries have not been paid more than the amount that was due at the date of the death of the Member.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes; if I have the privilege of the floor.

Mr. LLOYD. Yes, sir.

Mr. BARNHART. Does not the gentleman believe that in the case of the death of a Congressman the services of the secretary should be continued until a successor is elected, in order that the district may have some representation here?

Mr. BARTLETT. No.

Mr. BARNHART. I think so, myself.

Mr. BARTLETT. I voted a number of times, and still believe that we should vote, for a salary for our secretaries sufficient to maintain them here in Washington, and that we should put them on the roll and make them employees of the House, subject, of course, to be removed by the Member whenever he pleases to do so. That is my view about secretaries. I do not think we pay them enough in these years when the business of the Congressmen has increased. I believe they ought to be on the roll of the House. I do not think that in this day now of decreasing revenues and increasing expenditures we ought to set an example of giving money to somebody.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman's theory, then, would enable the district to have a clerical representative here until some successor should remove him?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. The law and the Constitution do not provide for any such and I do not believe we ought to do that just as a mere gratuity.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the House well understands that if a Member of Congress dies it is the custom to pay to his representatives one year's salary. If an employee of this House dies, it is the universal custom to pay his representatives an amount equal to six months' salary and to defray the funeral expenses, not to exceed the amount of \$250. Now, this lady is an employee of the House, in a sense, but as the law reads she is not an employee of the House, and thus far no allowance of any kind has been paid to a secretary, and it works a grievous hardship.

It is brought to the attention of the House as forcibly, perhaps, if not more so, in the death of the late Mr. PAYNE than in any other case that we have had. Mr. PAYNE was here one day in the House attending to his duties and the next day he was a corpse. The secretary drew the secretary's salary to the date when the breath left the body of Mr. PAYNE, and not a cent afterwards. The secretary, of course, had made his plans to stay with Mr. PAYNE until the end of the session of Congress, and now he is left by this action of Providence without any compensation, and actually it is true, as we find in some cases, that the secretaries have not money to get home with after the death of Members in the case of sudden death, and we think it but fair, inasmuch as we pay something to everybody else under the circumstances, that we should make some kind of a gratuity—if that is to be the term—to the secretary to the Member of Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not a fact that if these secretaries were put upon the roll as employees, in place of leaving it solely as money paid to Congressmen for their services, there might be some change of the rules?

Mr. LLOYD. Then, if they were placed on the rolls as employees of the House, their representatives would, according to the custom, receive in case of their death an amount equal to six months' salary and funeral expenses not to exceed the amount of \$250.

Mr. BARTLETT. In case of death of the employee?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes; and in that case a sum not to exceed \$250 for funeral expenses.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. This covers a case where a Member dies during the session of Congress. What would be done if, suppose after the 4th of March, between then and the first Monday of December following, the clerk of some Member dies? Is it proposed to pay him a sum equal to a month's salary?

Mr. LLOYD. This would not cover that case at all.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know; but what is the policy that it is proposed to establish?

Mr. LLOYD. Each case will depend upon its merits.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That may be; but you have got to have a general rule, and the Members should know what the policy of the committee is to be when it is established.

Mr. LLOYD. That policy has not been established, and the committee would be glad to know what the views of the House may be with reference to that contingency. We think that if the secretary of a Congressman is here in the discharge of his duties and the Member dies, there ought to be something in the way of compensation paid to that secretary beyond the salary, which stops absolutely on the death of the Congressman.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I think the resolution as amended ought to pass. If, as suggested by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT], the clerk was placed on the roll, he would draw his salary until the successor of the deceased Member was elected and sworn in, and he would draw a great deal more than is provided for here. As I understand this proposition, it is to pay to the clerk of a Member, upon a Member's decease, one month's salary in addition to what the clerk would otherwise receive.

Mr. LLOYD. To pay him an amount equal to one month's salary.

Mr. MANN. Well, that is a distinction like that between tweedledum and tweedledee. It is to pay him \$125.

Mr. LLOYD. Very well.

Mr. MANN. Now, the fact is that clerks of Members attend largely to the correspondence of the Members and to the routine work of Members, answering letters, and letters come in to a Member who is dead. People do not know. Much correspondence may be on its way when a Member dies. The clerk also attends to a great deal of routine work in the departments which can not properly be dropped at once. I think it is but fair to pay to the clerk a month's salary, with the expectation that the clerk will attend to and clean up the official business of the Member who has passed away, and attend to the work of the constituents of that Member which is current at the time. It is an eminently proper provision.

Mr. LLOYD. Question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

GEORGE CURTIS PECK.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 680 (H. Rept. 1234).

Whereas George Curtis Peck was the clerk of the Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE, late a Member of the United States House of Representatives from the thirty-sixth district of the State of New York, and is not entitled to compensation as such clerk after the death of the said Hon. SERENO E. PAYNE: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to pay to George Curtis Peck the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary of a clerk of a Member of the House, the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

With committee amendments as follows:

After the word "compensation," in the preamble, insert the words "under the law."

In line 2, after the word "Peck," insert the words "out of the contingent fund of the House."

In line 4, after the word "House," strike out "the same to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, is this resolution privileged? A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is the resolution privileged when it does not pay out of the contingent fund of the House?

Mr. LLOYD. It does pay.

Mr. BARTLETT. The amendment says "strike out."

Mr. LLOYD. It struck it out in one place and inserted it in another, in order to make better reading.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ANNA J. OURSLER.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 669 (H. Rept. 1233).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Anna J. Oursler, widow of J. R. Oursler, late a messenger on the soldiers' roll of the House, an amount equal to six months of his compensation as such messenger, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the funeral expenses of said J. R. Oursler.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution in cases of the kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

FOLDING SPEECHES.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 671.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of \$400, to be expended, under the direction of the Doorkeeper, for labor employed in folding speeches.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, in the last few days of the second session of this Congress there were an unusual number of speeches ordered printed, and there was not sufficient labor authorized by law to meet all the expense. We are now without funds to get any additional help, and we need to pay this additional amount that was incurred after the adjournment of Congress and just before the election.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this to pay for help that was hired without any funds to meet it?

Mr. LLOYD. There were some funds. There was a little money left. Part of this pays for labor incurred in folding speeches, for which we did not have the money to pay.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman does not mean to say that this is to pay for services that were employed without any money to pay for them—because that is absolutely prohibited by law!

Mr. LLOYD. There was a vast amount of work to do, and it was done. When we got through with the work it turned out that it was a little bit over the amount.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman has already, since Congress met, has he not, reported a resolution for folding speeches?

Mr. LLOYD. No, sir; I beg your pardon. I have not.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have a request for a deficiency appropriation for folding speeches. Within the last year or so the practice has grown up of having the Committee on Accounts furnish pay for additional help for folding speeches. If that practice is to continue, there will be no appropriations of that character carried in any appropriation bill. Why does the Committee on Accounts do this, anyway?

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Accounts had no information at all that this matter, or any of it, had been presented to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman ought not to go into these matters, because it has never been the custom for the Committee on Accounts to provide for help for folding speeches until the last year or two. Before that the money was always carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. LLOYD. I think the Committee on Accounts has never done it except in a few cases of special emergency.

Mr. FITZGERALD. There is no such emergency, because the Committee on Appropriations is now considering an urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. LLOYD. I am perfectly willing, if the gentleman insists upon it, to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman ought to withdraw it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I am quite confident that since I have been here we have repeatedly passed resolutions providing for additional

help in the folding room, to be paid for out of the contingent fund.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has been very rare until recent years. There is a request now from the Doorkeeper before the Committee on Appropriations for extra help in the folding room, and that request is pending in a bill that the Committee on Appropriations are at work upon. Two committees should not be providing money for this purpose. No one can keep track of it if they do. It may be necessary at times of great emergency for the Committee on Accounts to make some provision, but I do not believe such a situation exists at present. I have no knowledge or information about that.

Mr. LLOYD. There is no question about the necessity for this payment, but if the Committee on Appropriations will take charge of the matter I will withdraw the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. We have an estimate before us now.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not need to ask unanimous consent. He has a right to withdraw it anyway.

ATTENDANT FOR LADIES' RETIRING ROOM.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 678 (H. Rept. 1235).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives be authorized to employ a woman attendant for the ladies' retiring room, adjoining Statuary Hall, at a salary of \$800 per annum, and that same be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided.

Mr. LLOYD. With the following amendment: To strike out the word "Clerk," in the first line, and insert the word "Doorkeeper."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 1, by striking out the word "Clerk" and inserting the word "Doorkeeper."

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, there has recently been provided a ladies' retiring room, just off Statuary Hall. It has not been used yet, and the purpose is to employ an attendant, so that she may take charge of that retiring room. There can be no question but that this retiring room is one of the most necessary of any that could be found about this Capitol.

Mr. MANN. Is there any reason for employing a person there at an annual salary? Congress will not be in session all the time.

Mr. LLOYD. Statuary Hall is open the year round, and visitors are the persons who would use that room. Visitors are there every day in the year, and the room will be used every day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the old room where the newspapers were kept, and I believe it will be used all the year round. If it is to be open, an attendant should be there.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL TELEPHONE OPERATOR.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following resolution. This is the last one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 679 (H. Rept. 1231).

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized to employ one additional telephone operator, at a salary of \$900 per annum, to be paid monthly in equal installments out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the recall of judges.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the recall of judges. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, H. R. 19906.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 19906) making appropriations for

the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, with Mr. SAUNDERS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19906, the Post Office appropriation bill.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he desires to use any time now.

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes. How much time, Mr. Chairman, have we used upon this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has used 45 minutes. The other side has consumed 29 minutes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to go on for 5 or 10 minutes, and then I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. Chairman, we were discussing yesterday the numerous recommendations for new legislation and the change of policy on the part of the Post Office Department. I called attention to the recommendation of the Postmaster General in his last report.

He renews the recommendation embodied in his last annual report—

That Congress seriously consider the question of declaring a Government monopoly over all utilities for the public transmission of intelligence, and that steps be taken as soon as practicable to incorporate into the postal establishment the telegraph and telephone systems of the country.

I referred to his recommendation in regard to abolishing assistant postmasters, of which we have about 2,500 in the United States, and the proposition to let all Rural Delivery Service out by contract to the lowest bidder for four-year periods.

The Constitution of the United States, Article II, section 3, referring to the duties of the President, says:

He shall from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

The President of the United States this year has only favored us with an address upon recent legislative history and political economy. He has not referred to any of these subjects nor has he said he favors any of them. The people of the United States are interested in knowing whether or not the President of the United States favors the recommendation that we should declare a Government monopoly of the transmission of all intelligence by electricity, which would destroy every farmer's telephone in the country. It would involve an investment of billions of dollars.

It was said yesterday by the chairman of the committee that every recommendation of the Postmaster General is the recommendation of the President. Well, we are not so sure about that. Two or three years ago the Postmaster General of a Republican administration, Mr. Hitchcock, made similar recommendations in regard to the telegraph and telephone in his annual report, and it was given out by newspaper interviews and otherwise at the White House that the President disagreed with the Postmaster General on that subject.

Mr. MOON. Will the gentleman let me interrupt him a moment?

Mr. STEENERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MOON. I did not quite catch what the gentleman said a moment ago; but I want to ask this question: Is it not a fact that there is nothing in the pending bill on the subject of telegraph or telephones?

Mr. STEENERSON. Well, yes; I believe it was omitted; but I am discussing what is in the report of the Postmaster General. I stand corrected, as far as that is concerned; but the people of the United States are interested in knowing whether the President favors the letting of Rural Delivery Service out by contract, which provision is in this bill and will be in the bill unless it goes out on a point of order. The people of the United States and 44,000 rural delivery carriers who are to have their salaries cut down one-third are interested in that question, and they want to know it before they vote at the next election. They want to know whether the Government will declare a monopoly for the transmission of intelligence, so that they can vote understandingly. The people are interested in knowing whether the President favors Government ownership of all these utilities.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Not yet. If these recommendations of a Cabinet officer have the support of the President of the United States, the people of the United States want to know it, and for that reason I have drawn a very short resolution requesting this information on the part of the President of the United States, which I ask to have read in my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the House of Representatives what, if any, of the recommendations for new legislation contained in the last report of the Postmaster General he recommends for the favorable consideration of the Congress.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. HOWARD. I am very much interested in the question of telephones for the farmers. Under what theory does the gentleman think that if the Government of the United States were to take over the lines it would destroy the right of the farmer to have a telephone in his house?

Mr. STEENERSON. If the Postmaster General's recommendation is carried out, the Government will declare a monopoly of all telephone communication, as they do over the transmission of letter mail.

Mr. HOWARD. And would it necessarily follow that the farmer would lose his telephone?

Mr. STEENERSON. It strikes me that way; I may be mistaken about it. If the United States have a monopoly, there is no room for a private line.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman stated that there was quite a division of sentiment in the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads as to the recommendation of the Postmaster General in regard to the purchase of telephones and telegraphs.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I made no such statement. I said nothing about it.

Mr. HOWARD. I understood the gentleman to say that the committee was not unanimous.

Mr. STEENERSON. Then I think the gentleman is better informed on what took place in the committee than I am. The chairman states that that was not considered.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman seriously propose to ask the House to vote for his resolution?

Mr. STEENERSON. I dropped the resolution into the basket, to be referred under the usual procedure.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. But if it came from the committee, would he support the resolution in dead earnest?

Mr. STEENERSON. I certainly would.

Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman think that it would be more becoming for the House and the other branch of Congress to do more legislating with less interference from the Executive?

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, I just quoted a section of the Constitution of the United States which imposes upon the Executive the duty of recommending legislation. I think we have a right when a Cabinet officer dumps a report upon us which demands serious consideration to know whether he is speaking for the Chief Executive or on his own account.

Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further. I reserve the balance of my time; and if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], I will use some of my time now by yielding to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] for 30 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, this bill making appropriations for the Post Office Department in all its essential phases I believe to be one of the best bills ever reported to the House. There were a great many recommendations and suggestions made by the Postmaster General for modification of the methods pursued in the conduct of the department. Some of these recommendations were approved and others were disapproved. The committee believed that the recommendation of the Postmaster General to reduce the compensation of substitute carriers and clerks from 35 and 40 cents an hour to 30 cents was a recommendation which ought not to be adopted, and the committee, I believe, was unanimous in its conclusion not to recommend the suggestion of the Postmaster General in this particular.

The question of compensatory time for Sunday service rendered by clerks and carriers throughout the country was given careful consideration, and the department believed that to allow compensatory time off during the succeeding six days after the service is rendered is embarrassing to the department, and on the other hand it is believed by members of the committee that the humanitarian side of this subject should be considered, and that no man working for the Government should be called upon to work seven days a week. The tendency of the times is toward better conditions for working people, and legislation has been enacted by all of the States of the Union, and by the Congress itself, seeking to encourage better conditions between employer and employee, reducing the working hours, and giving a larger proportion of the earnings of labor to labor itself. In the face

of this condition throughout the industrial world it was thought to be wise not to adopt the recommendation made by the department giving it the opportunity to grant compensatory time whenever they think it most convenient; but it was believed by the committee that during the holiday season of the year the business of the department is so pressing that the executive officers of the department should have the right not to be called upon to grant compensatory time for Sunday service during the succeeding six days, and so there is a provision in the bill which directs the officers managing the Post Office Department to grant compensatory time for Sunday service rendered in the month of December during the succeeding January, but for all other months in the year for every hour worked on Sunday by the clerk or the carrier in the Post Office the compensatory time must be granted during the succeeding six days.

There was a recommendation made by the department requiring that carriers discontinue the delivery of mail to residences and business houses where either of these institutions failed to provide a receptacle on the outside of the door, but if such a recommendation were to be adopted it seems to me that in great office buildings, where there may be a thousand different business concerns, the carrier himself would not be allowed to enter any of these offices, and that the business of such offices would be disarranged, and the committee believed that also, and they have not recommended the adoption of that suggestion from the department.

The committee also believed that it was unwise to accept the recommendation of the department for biennial promotions among the clerks and carriers in the classified grades. The men who enter the Postal Service as clerks and carriers, in great cities at any rate, are usually required to serve as substitutes for from two to three years. They are required to report every day for duty. They are required to remain there every day on call until all of the men are placed at work before they are able to ascertain whether any employment is to be given to them. They are required to pay their car fare to and from the post office. The average compensation earned by a clerk or carrier during his substitute service does not reach more than \$30 a month, and when a man works for two or three years at the rate of not to exceed \$30 per month the fair assumption is that he must be in debt when he secures his regular appointment. When he is appointed he receives \$800 a year. Under the classification law governing the postal clerks and carriers men are automatically promoted from \$800 to \$900, \$900 to \$1,000, from \$1,000 to \$1,100, and between \$1,100 and \$1,200 75 per cent of the men in the \$1,100 grade are entitled to promotion after one year's service in the \$1,100 grade.

The proposition of the department was that, instead of promoting them automatically every year, both in the clerical and carrier forces and in the Railway Mail Service, they be promoted every two years. It seemed to the committee that this would be a great injustice to the men, and that it would be a detriment to the service as well, because you can not get the best there is in a man in this character of service unless you give him the right to hope for some preferment as the result of efficient service. The men who are employed in these places are not only required to work 8 hours, but under the present law they also must be on call for 10 hours, and when they leave their work and go to their homes they are also required to study the schemes that will enable them to accurately distribute the mail for dispatch to every section of the country. They are required to know every post office on a number of railroads, the time of the departure, and the arrival of trains, so that they will be able in the distribution of the mail to automatically throw the letters into the box which will dispatch that mail on the first train. This is an onerous task imposed on these men, and they get no compensation whatever for the time they are at work in the study of these schemes, and the department recommended that the men should be on call not for 10 hours, but for 12 hours a day and that during the 12 hours they would be required to work 8 hours, and in addition to the 8 hours required of them to work in the Post Office Department they would still be called upon to study the schemes which make for the efficiency of the department and the scientific dispatch of the mail. The committee decided that this recommendation was not one in which it could concur.

The reorganization plan embodied in the report of the Postmaster General and accepted by the committee is thought to be one of the most scientific business propositions suggested for the conduct of the Post Office Department that could be made. Some men, it is true, dissent from the opinion I have just expressed, but I have given careful consideration to the question involved in this reorganization plan for more than two years, and I believe that never in all the history of the Post Office

Department has there been a suggestion from any executive official in control of this institution which justifies the confidence of the Congress or the people of America to the extent that the suggestion for this reorganization does. It provides no new offices. It may do things with which many men in the House will not agree. It proposes to establish a new schedule of pay for postmasters; it fixes a new basis upon which this payment shall be made; it increases the receipts upon which the salaries are to be based, and to the ordinary man in the supervisory service of the Post Office Department it increases the receipts required to make his salary \$1,300 from \$80,000 to \$100,000, and so on all through the list. It places the service on a scientific, economical business basis, for it establishes the receipts as the basis of expenditure and limits the cost of operating the department and at the same time increases the efficiency of the department. It is said we are creating new offices. Not at all. There is no new office being created under this plan. We are not only not creating new offices, but we are, if our recommendation be adopted, suggesting the merging of the assistant postmaster into the supervisory branch of the service. We are not taking the assistant postmaster out of the service, and we are not in any essential sense reducing his salary. What we are doing is to change the five-division plan into a two-division plan, believing that the five-division plan is not only obsolete but cumbersome and ought not any longer to exist.

Now, what is the five-division plan? It consists of this. In post offices sufficiently large we have now a superintendent of registry, a superintendent of mails, a superintendent of delivery, a superintendent of money orders, and a superintendent of carriers. That makes five. Now, what we propose in this bill is to make one superintendent of finance, and give him jurisdiction over all financial matters in the post office in which he is employed; one superintendent of mails, who will have jurisdiction over the dispatch and receipt of mails, as well as the delivery of mails. This simplifies the work, it expedites the work, it economizes the conduct of the department, it makes for greater efficiency, it places a higher responsibility on the men appointed to those places and encourages them to hope for better things in the future. Their compensation is fixed upon the basis of the receipts of the office, and if the receipts increase their compensation is also increased.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. In just a moment. The assistant postmaster now in the second-class office, drawing \$800 a year, will not have his services dispensed with, but he will be transferred to a clerical place in the office, the maximum salary of which is \$1,100 a year. So that instead of being injured, he will have been benefited by the change. Of course, the maximum salary paid to an assistant postmaster in a second-class office is \$1,400. He will be transferred to a place as superintendent of finance, perhaps, or superintendent of mails, and his maximum compensation perhaps may not be to exceed \$1,300. Now I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOULDEN. I simply would like the gentleman, who is making a very lucid and able explanation of the bill—the best I have heard so far on the bill under consideration—state just what branches or departments will be included under the superintendent of finance.

Mr. MADDEN. All the money-order matter, all the registered matter, all the sale of stamps, all the pay rolls—everything that has to do with the monetary branch of the department.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the position be under the civil service?

Mr. MADDEN. All in the civil service; and I may say for the information of the committee that if this method shall be approved by the House and the recommendation of the committee become a law one of the men selected as superintendent of finance and superintendent of mails will by the direction of the Postmaster General be designated by the local postmaster as the acting postmaster in the absence of the postmaster, and this designation will be a permanent designation during all the period for which the postmaster is to serve.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. Will it necessarily follow where the assistant postmaster is qualified that he will be designated for either one of the places?

Mr. MADDEN. Not at all; if he is not qualified—

Mr. GOULDEN. I say, if he is qualified, as they should be.

Mr. MADDEN. If he is qualified, it is the intention of the department to select him for one of the places if he has earned the right to be recognized for efficient service.

Mr. GOULDEN. Who would have the right to designate these appointments?

Mr. MADDEN. The local postmaster.

Mr. GOULDEN. One more question, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. GOULDEN. I am now reading on page 13—and it affects the gentleman's city and mine alone, I think—where the receipts are \$20,000,000 and over the superintendent of finance shall receive \$3,800, and I desire to ask the gentleman, How does that compare with the salary paid assistant postmasters in these two cities of Chicago and New York?

Mr. MADDEN. The assistant postmasters in those places now are receiving \$4,000 a year. The assistant postmaster in each of these cases will be dispensed with as such, and if he has the qualifications to fill one of the other places there is no doubt but what he will get it.

Mr. GOULDEN. If the gentleman will pardon, I wish to say that the party occupying the place in the New York office as assistant postmaster is eminently qualified for any place, and should be preferred; but it would mean to him, if designated, a loss of \$200 a year in salary.

Mr. MADDEN. The men who are now acting in New York, Chicago, and other great cities of the United States as superintendents of mail, superintendents of delivery, and such superintendents as that, where they have under their jurisdiction anywhere from 3,000 to 3,500 men each, and where they are required to keep track of all the minute details of the office, are only getting \$3,200 a year now.

Mr. GOULDEN. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. REILLY of Connecticut. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOULDEN], as I understood him, referred to the New York post office as a case in which there would be a reduction in the salary of the assistant postmaster of \$200 a year, did he not?

Mr. MADDEN. Two hundred dollars.

In the readjustment of the department there will be cases where men will get less money and where men will get more money as the result of the readjustment, but in all cases where increases of salary result from the reorganization of the department it will be not only where they are entitled to it but have been entitled to it for the years gone by. But, on the other hand, if the receipts of the office fall the men in this class of the service, although now being classified for the first time in this bill, will have their salaries reduced correspondingly to the reduction in the receipts of the office. So that as a matter of fact the passage of this law will encourage the men in every office in the Union to look for business, to encourage progress, and to increase the receipts of the office. To-day there is no incentive whatever of this kind, and there is no reason in the world why the Post Office Department should not encourage the increase of its business just as much as any private enterprise does.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will reply at a later time.

Mr. MADDEN. Now, the Post Office Department recommended, for example, that the deposits in postal savings banks should be increased from the present amount allowed to be deposited up to \$2,000, and that the limit of \$100 of deposit for any individual for any single month should be taken off, so that, for example, if a man had \$300 and wanted to make a deposit, and he thought that he would like to deposit that money in the postal savings bank to-day, he would not be prevented from depositing more than \$100. Under the present limitation he would not deposit any part of his \$300. He would go away. He would deposit the money some place else. We have had hundreds of cases where men have come wishing to make a deposit and learned for the first time that the limit allowed to be deposited by any one man during a single month was but \$100, and they went away and refused to open an account at all. And so they want now for the House to concur in the recommendation that a man may be allowed to deposit any amount up to \$2,000, whether he does it in a single month or in a single year.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. Why is it necessary to encumber a system of this kind by putting a limit of any amount on postal savings? If people want to loan the Government money for 2 per cent, or want them to take charge of it and put it into the legitimate channels of commerce, when they themselves would not do it ordinarily, why limit it at all?

Mr. MADDEN. There is no reason at all why it should be limited. But the Senate in the bill which they sent over expressed the opinion, and the President vetoed the bill which the House and Senate passed, that the measure conflicted with the Federal banking law recently enacted, and this recommendation of the committee is based on that action, and we recommend the limit of \$2,000, with interest payable on only 1,000 of the \$2,000.

Mr. HOWARD. Under the present system of keeping an account against a man to see that he does not overdeposit, and also keeping his interest account, does it not cause a duplication of the work of the postal savings department and entail on the Government a greater expense to operate it?

Mr. MADDEN. I will say to the gentleman that if there was no limit placed on the deposits we would have very much greater deposits, and in consequence of that the cost of operating that branch of the Postal Service would be correspondingly less. We undoubtedly would have been on a very profitable basis to-day in the Post Office Saving System if we had had no limitation on the amount to be deposited. The money would have been taken from hiding. It would have been placed in the Postal Savings Bank System and redeposited in the local banks and put in the channels of trade. It would have helped the prosperity of the country. It would have encouraged many people to save money that do not now save. It would have encouraged them to have more confidence in banks; and when they had learned as the result of their communication and correspondence with the Postal Savings Bank System to invest in a Government bond, which is issued and purchasable by postal savings-bank depositors, they would soon learn to have still further confidence in investing their money in some other class of paper drawing a higher rate of interest, and they would become more patriotic citizens, more devoted to the Government, and better husbands and better wives, better sons and better daughters, and better in every way for the community in which they live.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for one other question.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOWARD. Has the gentleman given any thought to the issuance of these Government or postal savings bank bonds in small and varied amounts directly to the people and abolishment of the certificate system? I understand France has done that very successfully.

Mr. MADDEN. The commission charged with the responsibility of conducting the Postal Savings System already have authority to issue bonds to be purchased by depositors in the postal savings banks with the funds which they have there. And a great many of these bonds have been issued and a good many have been purchased, and they have the system already in force as the result of the Postal Savings System.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Did the committee get any information in regard to the amount of money that has been rejected on account of the restriction of the law, compared to the amount that has really been deposited?

Mr. MADDEN. For some time it has been shown that wherever a bank failed in any locality many people having deposits there came to the post office and undertook to make deposits in the postal savings bank; but the postal savings bank was not allowed to take the money, because the amount offered for deposit was too large for them to accept under the law. The amount is quite large.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I will say to my colleague that I was told that after the Lorimer failure in Chicago the Third Assistant Postmaster General received information that there was \$90,000 deposited—that is, accepted as deposits—and \$124,000 rejected in six days after that failure.

Mr. MADDEN. We had one man here in Washington at the time the United States Trust Co. failed, who came over to the post office and offered \$5,000 for deposit, and it was refused, and he took it all away.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. MADDEN. I do.

Mr. SLOAN. Why should we increase especially the amount that may be deposited in the banks of the country while another department of the Government has reduced from two-thirds to three-fourths the number of banks eligible to receive deposits in the United States, leaving large communities, whole counties, and parts of States in such position that they can not

qualify and can not receive them because they are not national banks?

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, wherever there is a national bank the tendency is to deposit money in the national bank. Where there is not a national bank I have no doubt whatever but that a regulation will be put in force to authorize the deposit of postal savings in a State bank.

Mr. SLOAN. Such is not the law at the present time.

Mr. MADDEN. No.

Mr. SLOAN. The law on our statute books prohibits the State banks from receiving these deposits.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

One of the important recommendations of the committee is the change of system for the payment of transporting the mails over the railroads of the country. Heretofore the railroads have been paid for the weight of the mail carried. The committee suggests to the House the adoption of a plan under which future payments will be made based on space and mileage. If the recommendation of the committee be adopted, I feel sure that the plan will prove to be much more scientific and that all concerned, the Government and the railroads, will in the end be better satisfied.

It is true that some opposition is manifested to the plan proposed. The railroads themselves, I believe, are not quite pleased with this plan. From all that I have been able to learn I judge that they would prefer the present system, but, after all, in the conduct of a great department, I think the most scientific and up-to-date methods should be employed. I am not in favor of doing any injustice to the railroads, and neither is any other member of the committee. On the contrary, we believe that ample justice should be done to them, and we think that our recommendation fully meets the case.

What could be more simple than a plan which pays the railroad company a fixed price for every mile movement of a car in which mail is carried? Everybody can understand what that means, for every unit of equipment employed is ascertainable. It requires no complicated figures to adjust the compensation due the railroads for the work performed, whereas under the present cumbersome system there is always a doubt as to what the weight of the mail is and how much the Government owes the railroads.

There may be a difference of opinion as to whether the committee has reached a just conclusion on the rate to be allowed, and I am free to confess that nobody can tell with exactness just what the rate should be. I think the railroad people themselves will admit that they do not know. If they do, they never have stated it in exact terms, as far as my knowledge goes.

What are the facts with respect to this important question? The railroad companies themselves have fixed the passenger rates of the country, and the record shows that prior to last year the average receipts for a period of five years from the passenger service of the railroads of the country were approximately 25½ cents a car mile, while last year they were only about 24½ cents.

It has seemed to the committee—and I am fully convinced of the justice of the committee's conclusion—that it will cost a railroad company less for a mile movement of a railroad post-office car and its contents than it does to move a passenger car, and inasmuch as the receipts from the passenger service on rates fixed by the railroad companies themselves amount only for the last year to approximately 24½ cents a car mile, it has been assumed by the committee that 21 cents a car mile for a full railroad post-office car and \$8 terminal charges, covering the switching at both ends of the route, which would make substantially 22½ cents a car mile, is at least the equivalent of the earnings of a car mile from the passenger service of the railroads.

For a half railroad post-office car the price fixed is 10½ cents and \$4 terminal charges, which is the equivalent for the price paid for the full railroad car, while for a quarter car the committee recommends the payment of 5½ cents per mile and \$2 switching charges, which gives a little more in proportion for this fraction of a car than for a full car.

For the storage-car service the committee recommends the payment of 20 cents a car mile, and this price is fixed because the storage car is moved at less expense than the other cars, for it is cargo, and is carried from one terminal to another without being disturbed.

The closed-pouch service, under the recommendation of the committee, is to be paid for under the weight plan, and the weights are to be ascertained by the clerks on the car, without any special weighing period.

If there can be a simpler method devised, I have not heard of it. Can anyone say that such a plan is unjust to the railroads? I think not.

The Postal Service is constantly growing. It has grown during my membership on the committee from \$170,000,000 per annum until to-day the cost of the service is \$325,000,000 per annum, and I predict that within the next 10 years, with all its great activities, reaching into every home in the land, furnishing not only the ordinary mail but packages of merchandise of every character through the parcel post, the volume of business will increase to a billion dollars annually.

It is the greatest service in the Government, for every man, woman, and child is affected by it. All are interested in it, and everybody should be familiar with its activities. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BULKLEY. Mr. Chairman, the subject of rural credits was mentioned in the platforms of all the great political parties in 1912, and each pledged itself to action for the betterment of credit facilities on the farm. The Democratic platform declared that the question is "of equal importance with the question of currency reform." The Republican platform contains substantially the same declaration: "It is as important that financial machinery be provided to supply the needs of the farmer for credit as it is that the banking and currency systems be reformed in the interest of general business." The Progressive Party pledged itself "to foster the development of agricultural credit."

In the spring of 1913 a commission of seven members appointed by the President traveled through Europe cooperating with a commission made up of members appointed by governors of the several States and some of the Canadian Provinces, to study agricultural credit conditions in the Old World. At about the same time the Department of Agriculture began an extensive study of the subject.

The President, in his annual message delivered on the 2d of December, 1913, presented to Congress "the urgent necessity that special provision be made also for facilitating the credits needed by the farmers of the country." The Committee on Banking and Currency promptly delegated a subcommittee, which began work on the question even before the Federal reserve act was finally disposed of. In January of this year the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate appointed a rural credits subcommittee, and the two subcommittees thus appointed held joint hearings and discussions from February to May.

The commission which traveled abroad made its report and recommendations, and the result of the best thought of the commission appointed by the President was embodied in a specific bill, S. 4246 and H. R. 12585, introduced simultaneously in the two Houses by Senator FLETCHER and Mr. Moss of Indiana. The commission bill deals only with land mortgage credit, the commission having come to the conclusion that short-term personal credit can be better dealt with at a future time. The result of the deliberations of the joint subcommittees on rural credits representing the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses was embodied in a specific bill, dealing, like the commission bill, only with land mortgage credit. It was introduced last May simultaneously by Senator HOLLIS and myself, S. 5542 and H. R. 16478. This bill has been before the country for more than seven months without drawing serious criticism. Absolutely no criticism fatal to any fundamental feature of the bill has been made. Yet we hear it said that it is impossible to secure an agreement about legislation on this vitally important subject. Believing as I do that the controversy over Government aid is the only thing that has prevented a complete agreement about rural credits, I purpose to devote the time now allotted me chiefly to this phase of the question. The Government aid proposal can not ultimately be ignored. We may as well discuss it frankly now.

I must confess to a sense of keen disappointment in the attitude of the Secretary of Agriculture, for whom I have the highest respect and the highest personal regard. There has been no question before his department of greater importance than that of rural credits, and he has no doubt given it more or less active attention for a period of nearly two years, yet in presenting his annual report last week he found it either impossible or undesirable to make any helpful criticism of the definite plans now pending before Congress, and he failed to offer any constructive suggestion or even to present a clean-cut discussion of Government aid, that particular aspect of the question which he says is the ground for the chief difference of opinion on the subject. The six pages which he devoted to this great subject treat the matter so vaguely as to suggest that he has no

policy at all, and so superficially as to lead the uninformed to wrong impressions about Government aid.

The Secretary is right in saying that "the chief difference of opinion arises over whether there should be special aid furnished by the Government," but that is not the clearest possible way to state the question, because it leaves us in the dark as to what is meant by "special" aid. I am entirely confident that the Secretary favors Government aid to agricultural credit, although he is opposed to what he terms "special" aid.

SEVERAL KINDS OF GOVERNMENT AID.

In order to make this discussion clear it will be necessary to enumerate the different forms which Government aid or State aid to agriculture may take, and for the present I shall confine myself to the subject of Government aid to long-time agricultural mortgages. There are no less than six forms in which such aid may be applied. First, the Government may loan funds out of its Treasury directly to individual farmers. Second, a bank may be incorporated to loan on agricultural mortgages such funds as it may raise by the sale of bonds, and its bonds may be guaranteed by the State. Third, a cooperative or joint-stock bank may be established and endowed by a State or Government with the amount of its organization expenses or with a capital sufficient to begin business. Fourth, a State or Government may subscribe to the capital stock of such a bank, taking perhaps all of its shares, perhaps only a part of them. Fifth, a State or Government may deposit public funds with such a bank either without interest or at a low rate of interest, or it may purchase bonds of such an institution, thus providing funds to be loaned for agricultural purposes. Sixth, an agricultural mortgage bank may be given special privileges by law—a monopoly, for example, or the right to compel nonborrowing landowners within a province to join in guaranteeing bonds, or the right to eject defaulting borrowers summarily without legal process, or the right to exemption from taxation of the institution's business, property, stock, or bonds. Another form of State aid is rather similar to one of those already enumerated, and consists in an agreement by the State to give a bank a certain line of credit in case of emergency, or in case of need to buy a quantity of its mortgages, or, to state it in another way and use a term with which we are now all familiar, to "rediscount" mortgages. Of course there may be combinations of two or more of these methods of State aid.

It will be observed that some of these methods of Government aid involve a subsidy or subvention to the farmer, while others may be so administered as to result in an entirely sound investment which may ultimately be repaid to the Government. Government guarantee of the bonds of an agricultural credit institution without compensation is clearly a subsidy from the Government. It is sometimes contended that it is a subsidy which costs the Government nothing. Probably, however, it does cost the Government something, even though the Government may never be called upon to make good its guarantee, since there is created a contingent liability on the State which is likely to affect its credit in borrowing money, though, of course, in some instances this effect is so slight as to be negligible. There can be no doubt, however, that the bank taking advantage of such a guarantee is getting something for nothing. Government endowment of a bank with an initial capital, or even with organization expenses, is also clearly a subsidy. Probably exemption from taxation amounts to subsidy, though on this point I shall have something further to say.

On the other hand, Government loans to individuals, Government subscription to capital stock, or purchase of securities, or the deposit of Government funds, may or may not amount to subsidy. It depends upon the compensation exacted by the Government for the benefits given. If the money be advanced without interest, or at a rate below the reasonable worth of the use of the money, subvention exists. If fair returns be exacted, the operation is that of investment, not subvention.

The subcommittee bill proposes the incorporation of local national farm loan associations, or borrowers' cooperative associations, whose sole function shall be to make loans on farm lands within limited territory. These associations are to be federated in 12 districts forming 12 Federal land banks which will correspond roughly to the 12 Federal reserve banks. The functions of these land banks will be to buy mortgages from the local associations as such associations need the funds and to raise the capital therefor by the sale of debenture bonds to the public. We propose that Government aid shall be extended not only by providing that the local associations and land banks shall be exempt from Federal, State, and local taxation, but also in two more direct ways—first, by purchase of stock in the proposed land banks in order to insure them a sufficient capital to begin business, and, second, by purchase from time to time of the debenture bonds issued by the land

banks, when such bonds are not readily absorbed by the investing public at a rate of interest which seems fair and reasonable to the Federal Reserve Board. These purchases are an investment, not a subsidy.

Some of the forms of Government aid which I have enumerated seem to be readily accepted in this country as sound, and meet with almost no opposition, while others are violently denounced as being unfair discrimination, class legislation, and so forth. Curiously, the distinction between those forms of Government aid which are readily accepted and those which are violently denounced does not depend upon whether the proposed aid is an investment or a subvention. For example, the spending of public money to provide for the organization of a bank for a public purpose is approved by all, so far as I know, though it is clearly a subvention.

Exemption from taxation of mortgages running to cooperative agricultural credit institutions, and of the bonds and capital stock of such institutions, seems to be generally approved. It was one of the provisions of the Moss-Fletcher bill specifically approved by the President of the United States, and I venture to predict that it will be approved by the Secretary of Agriculture. And it ought to be approved, since it means nothing more than that mortgaged farm lands shall be exempt from double or treble taxation. Yet it is clearly a special favor, in that we do not attempt at the same time to exempt the city mortgage from taxation; nor do we propose to exempt the farm mortgage unless it is made in favor of one of our proposed farm land banks. It smacks of subsidy from the Federal Government and compulsory subsidy imposed on the States; yet it is so obviously and substantially just that even the theorists have neglected to denounce it.

On the other hand, the proposal that the Government shall, if need be, make a reasonable investment in shares of stock of agricultural land banks comes in for its share of criticism, though it does not involve any subsidy whatever. This form of Government aid, however, will probably meet the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. At least, we have heard from him no criticism of an identical provision in the Federal reserve act with respect to Government subscription to the stock of the Federal reserve banks. But when we propose, as in section 30 of the subcommittee bill, that the Government shall invest in land bank bonds, a higher and safer security than land bank stock, a proposal carrying not the slightest trace of Government subsidy, I fear that we shall be told by the Secretary that we are proposing "special" aid and that he can not support us. He does not, however, clearly say this in his annual report, the only kind of "special" aid which he specifically disapproves in that document being Government assistance by cash or credit directly to the farmers.

WEAKNESS OF SECRETARY HOUSTON'S REPORT.

There is in the Secretary's annual report no clean-cut expression of approval or disapproval of any specific kind of Government aid, though this is the chief point of controversy in the subject of rural credits, and therefore the point concerning which we had reason to hope for constructive suggestion from the head of the department involved. The only clear implication ventured by the Secretary is that he would not approve the direct loan of cash or credit from the Treasury to the farmer. Such a plan has been proposed in some bills which have been introduced in Congress, but is not proposed in the bill of the joint subcommittee. I do not advocate such a plan myself; yet I can not but regret that the Secretary's report should discuss this proposal in a totally misleading manner and in terms calculated to discredit any suggestion of Government aid in any form. The report misleads by stating the following propositions, which are true, but carry a false implication:

He [the American farmer] is not in a condition of serfdom or semi-serfdom in which were some of the European peoples for whom Government aid was extended in some form or other during the last century. He is not in the condition of many of the Irish farmers for whom encouragement and aid have been furnished through the land-purchase act.

The implication is that Government aid to agricultural credit has been obsolete since the last century, except in Ireland. As a matter of fact, as I shall show presently, a very large proportion of all Government-aid projects that have ever been inaugurated have been started within the last 20 years. Within this period Government-aid projects have been started in all but the smallest countries of Europe. The policy of Government aid has spread to Egypt, South Africa, Latin America, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand, where it has been most successfully practiced. It was of value in establishing the economic independence of liberated serfs, but it has no intimate or necessary connection with the question of serfdom.

Secretary Houston's nearest approach to suggesting a constructive policy to be pursued comes in a vague and half-hearted suggestion that some plan would probably be beneficial along the general line of the Fletcher-Moss bill, or of the subcommittee bill without the Government-aid feature. The suggestion is most indefinite, but it includes these words: "Operating through private funds." If the Secretary proposes that we shall attempt to establish a long-term agricultural land-mortgage system for the benefit of small borrowers without Government aid of any sort, he is asking that we attempt that which in all the history of the world has never succeeded. Let me explain why this is so and review briefly the reported experience on this subject.

ADVANTAGES THE FARMER SHOULD HAVE.

There is no reason why a farmer should expect to repay capital borrowed for the purchase of his farm, or for the permanent improvement thereof, within a period of three or five years, if he has borrowed an amount which is a substantial fraction of the value of his property. The railroad or the manufacturing corporation would not think of undertaking such a thing, and the farmer should not. Yet mortgage loans in the United States are frequently made for periods of three years and seldom exceed five years. When the mortgage is due there is the risk of foreclosure and in any event the expense of negotiating a renewal or a new loan. Clearly, it would be to the farmer's advantage to be able to borrow for a longer period, as he would thereby not only save trouble and expense but would be relieved of anxiety. He would be certain that the land he is working will continue to be his, that the benefits of his care and his improvements will accrue to himself and to his family. The need for long-time nonrecallable loans is urged by all who have studied the question.

The farmer should have another advantage in borrowing. He should be able to repay a small installment of the principal of his loan each year, an amount so small that it will not be a serious burden to him, and yet so large that in the course of 30 or 35 years the entire debt will be extinguished. By this plan, which is known as the amortization plan, the farmer does not merely postpone the evil day when the principal sum of his debt comes due; he actually averts it altogether. The effect of long-term nonrecallable amortization loans, under such a plan as is proposed in the pending bill, is something more than a mere reduction of the rate of interest—the effect will be to provide that if a farmer continues for a term of years to pay on his mortgage an annual sum about equivalent to what he now pays in interest, he will have retired his entire debt at the end of the term, and in the meantime will not be bothered with threats of foreclosure nor with the trouble and expense of negotiating renewals.

He should have still another advantage. He should have the right to pay at his option the entire balance remaining due on his mortgage and clear his land of debt at any time he may be able to do so. He might have either one of two reasons for wishing to do this. He may prosper so as to be able to repay his debt in a time shorter than that in which he undertook to repay it, or he may find that after a few years interest rates have gone down so that he can negotiate a new loan on terms more advantageous than the original one. So he should have the right to pay in full when he pleases, yet the lender should have no option to call in the loan. This is not mere theory; it is the actual practice in almost every civilized country on the globe. Let us examine more carefully the conditions under which it is possible for this result to be accomplished, and we shall see the necessity for Government aid.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALEXANDER). Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS. Has the gentleman's subcommittee considered whether or not the granting of options to pay at any time would increase the interest rate?

Mr. BULKLEY. It would not under the system we propose. It would have no effect on it at all. It would, without doubt, increase the interest rate if you depended upon private lenders.

NECESSITY FOR GOVERNMENT AID.

It is practically impossible for the individual investor to make long-term loans on the amortization plan, as no one wants his capital repaid to him in small dribbles from year to year over a long period. If long-term amortization loans are to be made, they must be made by institutions of considerable size, so that the annual incoming amortization payments will be in sufficient volume for efficient reinvestment or for retiring obligations of the loaning institution.

Funds loaned on such long-term mortgages become fixed investments, and they should be so regarded. That is to say, such funds should not be derived from deposits payable on demand or short notice, but should be raised by the issue of bonds having a remote maturity, or even no maturity at all, being simply recallable at the option of the issuing institution. Land-mortgage institutions in Europe issue debenture bonds of this character, the whole series of bonds being secured by the whole series of mortgages owned by the issuing land-credit institution.

The flotation of such an issue, however, presents a serious difficulty. The public will not invest in such bonds unless it has absolutely implicit confidence in the institution issuing them. It has, therefore, been the earnest effort of the joint subcommittee to put into the bill every possible provision to secure public confidence in the bonds which it is proposed to issue. The bonds will be secured by mortgages made by reputable farmers, who will pledge lands to the value of at least double the amount of their loans; the appraisals are carefully guarded and are subject to Federal inspection; and the loans will be controlled by boards of directors, the members of which are neighbors of the borrowers, familiar with their character and the value of their lands, and at the same time themselves financially interested in avoiding the making of any improper loan. These mortgages will be guaranteed by the local associations making the loans, and the land bank issuing the bonds will also be responsible to the investors, whether the guaranty of the local associations is made good or not. To this is added the collective guaranty of all the land banks in the system.

Thus the security is so carefully guarded and so strongly guaranteed that the bonds will deserve public confidence. Yet it must be remembered that public confidence is a thing of slow growth, and that the investor is not likely to turn eagerly to a new form of investment unless it has such unqualified indorsement as to give him confidence. Such indorsement may come through a great banking house; it may come through some respected friend—and it need not by any means carry any guaranty with it. But the small investor having neither the time, the training, nor the facilities to investigate investments, naturally mistrusts his own judgment and hesitates to buy even good securities until some impression has been made on his mind that causes him to believe that he absolutely knows that they are good.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Those bonds of which the gentleman speaks are the bonds of what is sometimes called the *Landschaften* banks in Germany?

Mr. BULKLEY. They are similar in some respects. The loans are made by institutions similar in organization to the *Landschaften*, but each *Landschaft* association issues its own bonds independently, whereas we have provided for a federation of local associations and the issue of bonds by 12 large institutions, and then every bond issued by each one of those land banks is guaranteed by each one of the other 11, so that we have made a national security, whereas the *Landschaft* bond is a local security.

Mr. COOPER. I have read that the bonds of the *Landschaften* in Germany were quoted higher than those of the Imperial Government.

Mr. BULKLEY. I shall discuss that particular point later at another place in my remarks.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman stated a few moments ago that no farm-mortgage scheme had been successful without Government aid.

Mr. BULKLEY. I said it with some limitation. I said that no system of long-time agricultural land mortgages for the benefit of the small borrower had ever been successful without Government aid.

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman would not claim that the *Landschaften* in Germany had Government aid?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes; I will show the gentleman that before I get through.

Mr. HAYES. I mean no financial aid.

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes; they have had financial aid, too, and I will discuss that presently.

Such debentures as we have proposed could be sold on the say-so of any one of a number of great banking institutions that have built up public confidence in their judg-

ment. But bankers require to be compensated for underwritings, and frequently the profits they demand are excessive. In a system such as we propose, to be operated at minimum cost for the benefit of both the small borrower and the small investor, there is no room for middlemen's profits in the shape of promotion fees or underwriting commissions. Having established a security which is good, we must take means to bring this goodness to the knowledge of the public in some way other than through the great promoting and underwriting syndicates of bankers.

It is of course not necessary to contend that promotions and underwritings have not done much in the development of the country in the past; nor do we need to express any opinion as to how much such syndicates may be of service to the country in the future. But we do believe that it will be for the benefit of the people of this country if we can exempt the small agricultural loan from taxation by the banker and underwriter, as well as from taxation by the Federal Government, the State, and the municipality. We believe that this can be done. But, against the natural opposition of the middleman who has made his profits between the borrower and the actual lender, success in this direction can not be achieved without the interposition of a financial power which is entirely unselfish and yet great enough to command the full confidence of all the people. There is but one such power, and so we have provided for financial assistance from the United States Government. Thus alone can we be certain of securing for an agricultural credit system that prompt success which will be necessary to command and retain the confidence of both borrower and lender.

Without such Government support as is provided by our bill, it is fair to predict that the land-credit system will be slow and uncertain in its beginnings and incapable of giving substantial relief for many years to come, and, though it can not positively be said that such a system would not succeed at all, it is fair to say that success is doubtful, and that there is not at hand in all the history of the world a single example of the success of a land-mortgage system on the long-time amortization plan and for the benefit of small borrowers which has not had public financial aid.

As a warning against taking chances as to what might happen if these newly established cooperative institutions should not at once command the confidence of the public to such an extent that adequate funds would be provided for their operation, I want to read a brief quotation from Mr. Henry W. Wolff, the great English authority on cooperative banking. I quote from page 258 of his work, *Cooperative Banking*:

Bankers in Germany are very much given to speculation and could, with a little clever maneuvering, easily spoil the market for land bonds, forcing them up or down at pleasure and depreciating them generally by making quotations unsteady. Nothing, of course, could be more detrimental to a mortgaging society. With money in their pockets, the societies are able to meet such machinations, and to regulate the supply of the market, so as to keep the bonds at a steady quotation, which is not only desirable in itself and certain to benefit their credit, but which is in addition specially important to their members, since fluctuations of capital value are sure to influence the rate of interest.

The German cooperative land-mortgage societies, to which Mr. Wolff had reference, had all received Government aid of one kind or another. His statement is very suggestive of what would be likely to happen in this country should we attempt to start without Government aid. With the Government aid provided in this bill the system can start as soon as the borrowers are ready and can be proved a success before it has the cooperation of a single investor; as soon as the success is proved, investors will be plenty.

PRECEDENT IN FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

The plan proposed is based on the provisions of the Federal reserve act, and the proposed government aid is similar and parallel to the Government aid provided by that law. The Federal reserve act provided that if banks eligible to membership in the Federal reserve system should not subscribe to the capital stock of the proposed Federal reserve banks an amount sufficient to provide the required minimum capital, then subscriptions should be thrown open to the public, and if public subscriptions should not provide an adequate amount, then the Secretary of the Treasury was required to subscribe the balance on behalf of the United States. The provision for Government subscriptions to the stock of the proposed land banks in the pending bill is substantially identical—the Secretary of the Treasury must subscribe if the public does not subscribe enough to insure success. The Federal reserve act provides for the deposit of Government funds in the Federal reserve banks, and it provides for the issue through the Federal reserve banks of Federal reserve notes, with no limit other than the effective demand, the notes being the direct obligations of the United States. The

present bill provides that under certain circumstances Government credit may be used for the benefit of the proposed land banks by the purchase of limited quantities of their bonds, a transaction substantially parallel to the issuance of notes provided for in the Federal reserve act.

The use of the public credit to support farm mortgage loans, therefore, is justified by the apparent necessities of the situation as well as by the precedent of Government aid to commercial finance created by the Federal reserve act, which has proved so acceptable to the country. That is to say, it is justified by theory and precedent. It is further justified by the experience of all the nations which have established land-mortgage systems in the interest of the small borrower, and these countries comprise the greater part of the civilized world. Though the character of Government aid varies in the different countries, in the different provinces, and at different times in the development of land-mortgage systems, all experience shows that public aid of one kind or another has been given in the establishment of successful systems of long-term mortgage credit. The State or Government may be an imperial or Federal central government; or it may be a subdivision, a province, or a State. In practice there is no uniformity of method; all practical systems have been adapted to the special needs which they must meet and to the means available. The only uniformity lies in the uniform presence of some sort of public aid in every successful land-mortgage system for small borrowers. Lessons we may learn from the practice of other lands thus lead us to the same conclusion as theory and precedent.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. As the gentleman probably knows, I introduced a bill providing for the revising of the postal savings bank law so as to take the limit off deposits and permit the loaning of money to farmers and workingmen home builders. Have the committee considered the matter of making that both a land loan and a workman's home ownership loan measure?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes. Unfortunately I have not time to discuss in full the gentleman's proposition, but I will say briefly that workingmen dwelling in cities are at present much better taken care of, through the building and loan associations, than the farmers are. As a matter of theory, I do not see very much distinction between the two, and so far as I am personally concerned I would be glad to extend the operation of the law to home owners in the cities. But I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we are having already more trouble than we can carry in extending it to the farmers, although it has been directly promised to the farmers.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It seems to be a matter of a good deal of difficulty to get Government aid extended to the producers of wealth in this country, whether farmers or workingmen, when it conflicts with the profit of money changers.

Mr. BULKLEY. I am sorry to say that is true, and we are trying to remedy that as best we can.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. The workingmen home owners are getting money by paying exorbitant rates of interest to money loaners.

Mr. BULKLEY. That is very largely true so far as collateral loans are concerned, but the mortgage loan situation is in fairly good shape on account of the operations of the building and loan associations.

EXPERIENCE IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Direct Government loans to tillers of the soil are made by Great Britain, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, New Zealand, and some of the Australian Provinces. Debentures issued by land-mortgage institutions are guaranteed either by the central or provincial governments in the following countries: Austria, Switzerland, Norway, Egypt, Australia, Mexico, Argentina, and Uruguay. The following Governments have contributed by endowment to the capital stock of land-mortgage institutions: France, Italy, Hungary, Roumania, and Sweden. Subscriptions to the capital stock of such institutions have been made by the Governments of Hungary, Roumania, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Philippine Islands, and Chile. Government funds are loaned to such institutions in France, Italy, Servia, Chile, and Japan. From all of these lists I have omitted mention of Germany and the German States, because I shall discuss Germany separately.

I shall mention these examples in greater detail, taking up first those Governments which make direct loans to the farmer.

In England the small holdings and allotments act of 1908 enables the British Government to take all the land owned by any individual in England or Wales in excess of 50 acres and to sell or lease it to a farmer or laborer. Long-time credit is given to purchasers of such lands.

The British Government has been appropriating since 1911 about a million dollars a year for the work of the Scotch board of agriculture, a part of which is the making of loans to small land holders on the long-time amortization plan.

In Ireland the British Government makes long-term loans and free grants for agricultural purposes through four official bodies, the most important of which, known as the estates commission, is said by Ambassador Herrick to be the greatest body in the world for using the credit of the State to enable farmers to acquire real estate. Since this commission was established, in 1903, it has accomplished a change of title to two-thirds of the agricultural land in Ireland and committed the British Government to obligations amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars.

The Russian Government by direct loans to farmers has enabled the ex-servs to acquire lands to an aggregate value of billions of dollars. The colonization of Siberia has been promoted largely by Government loans and free transportation provided by the Government. The Peasants' State Land Bank is the largest land-credit institution in the world; it is a financial organ of the Russian Government.

The Russian policy has proved successful from a social and economic point of view, in that it has made possible the breaking up of great estates into small holdings and laid the foundation for the independence of the agricultural class. The Government has, however, been obliged to meet heavy losses, as many interest payments have been defaulted and fear of insurrection has caused the canceling of many mortgages.

The Province of Finland loans its funds to communes and to cooperative societies for colonization purposes. The territorial credit establishments for Livonia, Esthonia, and Courland were enabled to begin business by the advance of Government funds.

Denmark inaugurated in 1899 a home colonization policy, granting direct Government loans to small agricultural holders.

Sweden also allows loans from the public funds direct to small farmers.

The New Zealand system of direct loans to settlers has proved entirely successful.

New South Wales, under the act of 1899, grants to settlers direct loans financed by the issue of Government bonds.

Queensland in 1901 created a commission to make direct loans of State funds to settlers. These funds are secured either out of general appropriations or the sale of State guaranteed debentures.

I now turn to those States which aid by guaranteeing the obligations of land-mortgage institutions.

In Austria there are provincial land-mortgage institutions in all but two Provinces. These institutions are practically bureaus of the provincial governments. Their debenture bonds are guaranteed by the Provinces.

In Switzerland the Mortgage Bank of St. Gall was created and is guaranteed by the Canton.

The Norwegian Government guarantees the debentures issued by the Norwegian Bank for Laborers' Holdings and Dwellings, founded in 1903 with Government funds.

In Egypt the Government guarantees not only the debentures but the dividends on the stock of the Agricultural Bank of Egypt. This institution was established on Government initiative in 1902, after it had been proved that the Credit Foncier Egyptien, a private institution without State aid, was unable to help small borrowers.

The Province of South Australia guarantees the bonds of a State bank established in 1895 to make loans to farmers, cattlemen, and others engaged in rural industries.

In Western Australia a State bank for a similar purpose issues Government bonds under the act of 1894.

Victoria sells bonds to finance bank loans to farmers under the act of 1890.

The Federal Government of Mexico guarantees the debentures of the Institution for the Encouragement of Irrigation Works and the Development of Agriculture chartered in 1908.

The Argentine Government guarantees the notes and bonds of the Banco Hipotecario Nacional founded in 1886.

Uruguay guarantees the notes and bonds of the Banco Hipotecario del Uruguay.

State endowment is not unusual. I shall mention some examples of it.

France, by the law of 1852, appropriated 10,000,000 francs as an endowment to be distributed among institutions incorporated under that law.

In Italy there are five very old savings banks which make loans on farm mortgages and issue debenture bonds against them. All of these banks were created by endowment secured either from Government funds or from philanthropic funds.

The Hungarian Government contributed a liberal endowment fund in founding the National Land Credit Institute in 1879, and it also endowed the National Federation of Land Credit Institutions which was established in 1911.

The Roumanian Government in 1873 contributed subventions to three institutions organized on the *Landschaft* principle for the benefit of large landed proprietors.

In order to put an end to difficulties arising from the attempt to handle the land-credit problem by private institutions without State aid, the Swedish Government found it necessary in 1861 to establish and endow the Swedish General Mortgage Bank, which is an association of *Landschaft* organizations similar to the land banks proposed in the pending bill. A further subsidy was voted to this bank in 1890.

Many times states and governments have purchased stock in land banks:

The Canton governments in Switzerland afford an illustration. The Mortgage Bank of Berne secured its initial capital from the canton government, and is a depository of public funds. In the canton of Vaud the government subscribed to a majority of the stock of the Mortgage Bank of Vaud and guarantees a 4 per cent dividend to all stockholders. The several communes in the canton supplied all of the initial capital of the Land Credit Bank of Geneva. The canton owns a substantial part of the capital stock of the Mortgage Bank of Fribourg.

The Hungarian Government contributed to the capital stock of the *Boden-Kredit Institut* established in 1863.

The Roumanian Government in 1908 subscribed to the capital stock of the Rural Bank, an institution established for small borrowers.

The Mortgage Bank of the Kingdom of Denmark was founded in 1906 on capital furnished by the Government.

In 1903 Norway founded the Norwegian Bank for Laborers' Holdings and Dwellings with Government funds.

The Agricultural Bank of the Philippines was established in 1908 with capital supplied by the insular government.

Finally, we turn to examples of the investment or deposit of public funds.

France, after 26 years of active discussion of the question of land-mortgage credit, enacted the law of 1852, which authorized the National Government and the departments to purchase each year certain quantities of debentures of the land-mortgage institutions authorized by the law. This feature is strikingly similar to section 30 of House bill 16478. It is to be noted that the French law of 1852 was the ripe product of 26 years of agitation and debate, and also that it has stood the test of more than 60 years of practical operation, with no substantial change found desirable.

It is to be noted, however, that the *Credit Foncier*, the great institution which grew up under this law, is a joint-stock corporation and enjoyed a legal monopoly of land-mortgage business for some years. The legal monopoly was discontinued, but the bank has continued to enjoy a substantial practical monopoly. In consequence the bank has inclined to do that business which was most profitable and has neglected the small farmer, so that in spite of the great success of the *Credit Foncier* in its own field, the French Government has found it necessary in recent years to come more directly to the aid of the small farmer. By the law of 1906 the State obtains funds from the Bank of France and lends them to small agricultural borrowers through a system of rural banks, composed entirely of farmers and subject to the general control of the ministry of agriculture. French experience, therefore, shows the necessity not only for Government aid but for a small loaning unit organized on the cooperative plan and having either actual or potential competition, as provided in the *Hollis-Bulkeley* bill.

Land-mortgage debentures of the old Italian savings banks and of the *Istituto Italiano di Credito Fondiario*, organized in 1890, are legal investments for the Italian Government, as well as for the Provinces and municipalities of Italy.

The Servian Government in 1862 founded a land-mortgage institution which is to-day the depository of national and communal funds.

The Chilean State Land Mortgage Bank, founded in 1855, is owned and managed by the Chilean Government. It is of interest to note what Ambassador Herrick says in his new book, "Rural Credits," about Chilean land-mortgage debentures:

Land credit was organized in Chile while the Indian and buffalo in western United States could roam from the Gulf of Mexico to the Canadian border without crossing a railroad track or seeing the face of a white settler. Loans of 33 years, repayable by annuities, were being granted in Chile when the farmers of Kansas were losing their homesteads by the foreclosure of three and five year mortgages. Chilean mortgage bonds or debentures are officially listed on the *Paris Bourse* and have been made legal investments by the French ministry of finance for all purposes for which even Government bonds may be used. They are bought also by English bankers and find a ready market in other

parts of the European Continent where offers of American mortgage bonds would be refused.

The Chilean land-credit law was enacted in 1855, three years after that of France, and it has proved so satisfactory that very few amendments have been made. The law is a general one, allowing any persons who comply with its terms to form a company. A number of companies have been formed thereunder and are doing a good business. Nevertheless they operate at a disadvantage, because of the fact that the Chilean, like the French, Government organized a State bank under the general law, and although it has not given this institution a monopoly it has invested it with such privileges that no others can compete with it successfully. It holds two-thirds of the mortgages taken by bond-issuing land banks in Chile, and it is able to hold so many more than its competitors that it absolutely dictates the rate of interest.

The bonds of the bank have been made legal investments for all persons and purposes and have been purchased in large amounts by the Chilean Government, not only because of their intrinsic soundness but in order to give them a popular currency. The bonds are guaranteed by the State, which has for its own protection the mortgages taken from borrowers and the reserve.

This high praise is given to the Chilean system in spite of the fact that the Government has suffered severe losses on several occasions on account of its guaranty of the bonds. It is apparent that these losses have neither wrecked the Government nor discredited the bonds, but that this Government-aided system has established land credit in Chile on a sound basis most advantageously to the farmers of that country.

The Government of Japan provides cheap loans to the *Noko Giuko*, or small local land-credit institutions, and has voted them subsidies besides. The *Nippon Kwango Giuko* is the central land-credit bank for large loans. The Imperial Government assisted in its establishment by guaranteeing dividends on its capital stock for a period of 10 years.

GERMAN LAND-CREDIT INSTITUTIONS.

Land-mortgage credit in Germany is supplied principally by four different kinds of institutions—*Landschaften*; mortgage-credit banks of the States, Provinces, and districts; joint-stock mortgage banks; and savings banks. In amount of loans outstanding the *Landschaften* and savings banks are far more important than the other two groups.

The *Landschaften* are cooperative organizations of borrowers for obtaining capital on the credit of the collective mortgages of their members. Ordinarily they have no share capital, but each borrower guarantees without limit the debts of all. In some cases lands not mortgaged are also held as security for the obligations of these associations. They are nonprofit seeking, except in the sense that there is a profit to the borrowing members in securing advantageous loans.

It is sometimes supposed that the *Landschaften* constitute an example of the success of land-mortgage credit institutions without any form of Government aid. This is not by any means true, though they exist practically without Government aid to-day, and it must be said that their debenture bonds without Government guaranty or support have maintained a very favorable position in the market. It is sometimes stated that *Landschaften* debentures sell on a more favorable interest basis than Prussian or Imperial German bonds. This is something of an exaggeration. The truth is stated by J. R. Cahill in the report which he was commissioned to make by the British Board of Agriculture and Fisheries on "Agricultural Credit and Cooperation in Germany." Cahill says, referring to *Landschaft* bonds:

The quotations of the majority of these appear to remain from under 1 to about 2 per cent lower than Prussian or Imperial Government stock bearing the same rate of interest. More than a century ago they proved their strength. The writer was informed by the director of one association that 4 per cent Prussian stock in 1802 to 1805 stood first at 83, then at 50, and in 1808 at 20, yet that Silesian association bonds did not sink below 50.

It is obvious that during the Napoleonic wars the very existence of the Prussian State was at stake, whereas war does not destroy land nor entirely destroy its value. So in an exceptional case 100 years ago *Landschaft* bonds sold on a materially better basis than Prussian bonds, but that is not the rule.

Frederick the Great created the first *Landschaften*, which were originally compulsory associations of all large landowners within a Province, all their estates, whether the owners borrowed or not, being by compulsion involved in the guaranty of the bonds of the provincial association. Frederick endowed the original *Landschaft*, that of Silesia, with the equivalent of \$432,000, and also subjected the Crown lands in Silesia to the collective liability securing the debenture bonds of this *Landschaft*. All the early *Landschaften* received Government grants in cash to begin business; the amounts of such grants were not very large, yet the aid thus given was necessary and substantial, especially since there was added to it a compulsory liability of all manorial landowners within the several Provinces, and in some cases Crown lands and forests were also subjected to this liability. There were further cases of Government grants

to the *Landschaften* after the Napoleonic wars. In recent years the Bavarian Agricultural Bank, which is one of the most important of the 24 German *Landschaft* associations, was, as Cahill says, "practically founded and capitalized by the State" in 1896.

It is clear then that the *Landschaften*, the first successful institutions supplying long-time agricultural credit on the basis of debenture bonds, were brought into being by the Government, and were started only with the substantial assistance of the Government.

The *Landschaften* have proved an example to the world of the advantage which the farmer may receive through the issue of long-time debenture bonds secured by collective mortgages. It should be remarked that most of their strength has come from cooperation and not from Government aid, though it is important to note that Government aid established that first confidence which is so absolutely essential to a new financial enterprise. They did not, however, prove an unqualified success in rendering service to the small borrower. Of them Ambassador Herrick says:

The *Landschafts*, like their aristocratic members, adjusted themselves with bad grace to the march of events. On the breaking up of feudalism they gave very little help to the plebeian landowners and practically none at all to the liberated serfs. In 1887 the German minister of agriculture reported that the *Landschafts* did not reach the one-team farmer, that is, the farmer of 18 to 34 or even 61 acres. In 1895 Sir Frederick A. Nicholson, after an exhaustive investigation in Germany, declared that they had failed to assist the majority of small farmers. Hence the service which the *Landschafts* are now doing this class began within the last 15 or 20 years.

It is thus apparent that at a period 126 years after the foundation of the first *Landschaft* the majority of small farmers had still failed to receive any benefit from the system. In countries where Government aid has been more direct and vigorous it has required no such period for the benefits to reach the small farmer.

Side by side with the *Landschaften* there are in Germany 16 public institutions established for a State, Province, or administrative district which make loans to farmers on mortgage security. The liabilities of each of these are guaranteed by the State, Province, or district which created it. Ambassador Herrick, after showing that neither the *Landschaften* or private capital could fill the needs which these institutions were organized to meet, says:

The State, therefore, intervened from a national necessity, and in organizing land credit for the general purposes of agriculture, granted a greater degree of assistance than was available to the nobility in the *Landschafts*.

Cahill says of these institutions that they grant loans more cheaply than the joint-stock mortgage banks, the majority of which do not find it profitable to lend at all on small properties. The savings banks, Cahill says, not only charge higher rates, but grant loans only subject to recall and allow gradual amortization only on a limited proportion of their loans. He states, however, that there are certain drawbacks incident to the official administration of these State and provincial institutions, and expresses the opinion that "organizations of landowners governed by landowners which confine their business to rural mortgages are better able to take in consideration all the conditions in arriving at their decisions." This comment is interesting in that it shows that the institutions having public aid can serve the small borrower more cheaply than the strictly private institutions; yet it shows at the same time that extreme official administration is to be avoided, being inferior in efficiency to the management of local landowners. These criticisms by Cahill on the German system justify the Government aid and local management provided in H. R. 16478.

I have said that there are four classes of institutions dealing in land-mortgage credit in Germany, but the *Landschaften* and public-credit institutions which I have already discussed are by far the most important in the class of business which we are considering. Herrick says:

Nearly all long-term reducible loans in Germany are made by the *landschafts* and public, or semipublic, credit institutions. The reason is easily explained. Such loans, repayable by annuities running through periods of many years, can not be made out of funds subject to recall. If the money is raised by the sale of debentures, they must have no fixed maturity if amortization of the loans is planned. But instruments of this kind, depriving the holders of the right of demanding the principal of their investments, can not be sold in quantities unless guaranteed by the Government or a concern connected with it; at least, this has proved to be the case in Europe. The loans from private sources are generally for short terms; that is, under 10 years and are repayable in lump or in a few instalments.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULKLEY. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. What is the extreme amortization period?

Mr. BULKLEY. In some of the European countries it runs as high as 75 years.

I have already quoted Cahill to show that the private joint-stock mortgage banks of Germany are unable to give the farmer as reasonable accommodation as the public land-credit institutions, and that, in fact, they do but a small proportion of the land-credit business. Of them Herrick says:

The lack of success of the German land-credit banks as regards farm loans has been attributed to various causes. But the trouble seems to be that only a few of them have the necessary size and standing to enable them to sell bonds which have no fixed time for maturity, and that in consequence of their inability to raise money by such investments, they are not in a position to grant long-term, reducible loans of the kind needed by agriculture. The proof of this lies in the fact that the two big banks which have gained the confidence of the investing public do a large farm-mortgage business, nearly all of which is on the amortization plan and represented by debentures not recallable by the holders.

It will be noted that Mr. Herrick says there are two of these banks big enough and strong enough to have gained the confidence of the investing public and therefore able to do a large farm-mortgage business on the amortization plan. What are these two banks, and have they had any Government aid? Ambassador Herrick answers the question:

These two concerns are the Bavarian Mortgage and Exchange Bank of Munich and the Prussian Central Land Credit Co. The King and Queen of Bavaria and high State officials were charter members of the former when it was founded in 1835. The latter, which was established in 1870 with the special object of aiding agriculture, is a semipublic institution. * * * The Prussian Central Land Credit Co., a joint-stock corporation, was the outcome of the efforts of Prince Bismarck to create a national mortgage institution for the great Empire that he was forming. He assisted three powerful banking houses to obtain a charter by a special law, and he persuaded France, whom Germany was about to fight, to order the then president of the Credit Foncier to serve on its board of directors. The Government Bank of Prussia bought a large block of stock so as to give the new concern prestige and aid its first ventures.

The German savings banks make loans in very large volume to farmers, but as these loans are made out of the funds which the banks must repay to their depositors on demand they are not able to make long-term loans on the amortization plan, and, according to Cahill and Herrick, they do not attempt to do so. They also charge higher rates than the *Landschaften* and public credit institutions. For these reasons their practices can give us no light on the problem of how best to secure long-term reducible loans at the lowest possible rates of interest.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BULKLEY. If I yield to the gentleman I must have some more time.

Mr. STEENERSON. I will yield the gentleman 15 minutes when he needs it.

Mr. BULKLEY. I thank the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Has the gentleman any information as to Government postal savings banks in Europe loaning their money to farmers and workmen?

Mr. BULKLEY. I can not give the gentleman full information, but in any case the amount that they loan on farm mortgages is not large. It is not a material element.

Mr. NORTON. I want to ask the gentleman a question. In reply to the gentleman from Illinois the gentleman from Ohio stated that he did not recognize any difference between Government aid in loans to workmen and to farmers.

Mr. BULKLEY. In endeavoring to answer the question briefly I perhaps may have said something of that kind; but I meant to say that there was no substantial difference. Of course there is a difference, because it must always be Government policy to encourage the production of the food supply for the people.

Mr. NORTON. I want to congratulate the gentleman on joining the forces for Government aid. But I wanted the gentleman to make clear that there is a distinction in principle.

Mr. SLOAN. If the gentleman from Ohio will permit, is not the difference this, that your loan is based on the earning power of the mortgaged property instead of the sale value?

Mr. BULKLEY. It would be based primarily on the earning power, and there would be some distinction on that ground.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I think the experience shows in Europe that in the loaning system there would be no difference in ability to pay.

Mr. BULKLEY. I think that is substantially true, and I am in sympathy with the gentleman from Illinois; but I hope he will not pursue that any further, as it is a question not at issue at this time.

Mr. NORTON. The principle is not in the ability to pay, but the principle is in the object and purpose of the Government going into the aid of credit to farmers who produce something that is needed by everyone in the country.

Mr. RAGSDALE rose.

Mr. BULKLEY. I will yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I was merely going to suggest that I was a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BULKLEY] is chairman, and I have some idea of the enormous amount of work he has devoted to this argument; and I would ask, as a courtesy to those who want to hear it, that he be allowed to present it in a connected form, and then, after he gets through, gentlemen can ask such questions as they wish.

Mr. SMITH of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to second the motion.

Mr. BULKLEY. I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. Wolff, the great English authority from whom I have already quoted, in his work, "Cooperative Banking," discusses the failure of the *Landschaften* organizations to serve the needs of the small farmer and says, at page 249:

It is on such grounds chiefly that various Governments, some considerable time ago, took the matter into their own hands, deeming it to be their duty to do so. We shall see that cooperative mortgage-credit institutions are fully as practicable for small owners as for large. But the fact was not at once perceived. And one can scarcely be surprised at the various Governments desiring not to let their horse starve, while the cooperative grass was slowly—very slowly—growing. "Paternal" Government interference, which means State socialism, is so much on the increase, to the discouragement of individual effort, that one scarcely cares to see additional arguments advanced in its favor. However, in this particular matter, it is impossible not to agree with the late Dr. Buchenberger, who testified that the Government institutions have plainly done good, and have, above all things, achieved their particular purpose of bringing appropriate assistance to the small agriculturists.

This concludes my brief survey of foreign land-mortgage credit institutions. In making it I have quoted many times directly from Ambassador Herrick's new work, "Rural Credits," and I am also indebted to this work for much of the information which I have condensed and submitted without quotation marks. The ambassador's very complete study of the land-mortgage credit institutions of the world shows clearly as a matter of historical fact that every success in the field we are considering has been attained by the assistance of Government in some form. The showing to this effect is the more impressive and the more incontrovertible because Mr. Herrick's work was not written with the idea of establishing the doctrine of Government aid as a rule of action in this country. On the contrary, he takes a position substantially opposed to it. We may therefore feel the more certain that if there had been in all history a single successful example of the establishment without Government aid of a system of long-term reducible farm-mortgage loans for the benefit of the small borrower Ambassador Herrick would have found it and described it. But he has not.

PROPOSED AID A PROPER GOVERNMENT FUNCTION.

Why then are we to cast aside all that is taught us by the experience of the whole civilized world during a century and a half of efforts to solve this great problem? What reason is there that our Government should refuse to adopt the most essential and fundamental element which has contributed to the success of small farmers' land credit everywhere else in the world?

Ambassador Herrick says:

Special legislation either for individuals or classes would now be revolutionary and also would deaden the spirits of those who would rely on it. The American farmers are better men than the European peasantry. Furthermore they are the most independent and self-reliant part of the country's population. It does not seem likely that they will demand privileges and special favors devised for conditions which have no parallel in this country, and which would do them in the long run more harm than good.

All of us will agree with the ambassador in praising the American farmer, and we may also agree with him in opposing special legislation for individuals or classes if he means by it the direct appropriation of Government funds to be paid to individuals or corporations to increase the profits of a business, as is proposed by the ship subsidy advocates, or if he means such special legislation as has from time to time been enacted for the benefit of certain individuals and classes in pursuance of the so-called protective tariff system, which has indeed deadened the spirit of those who have relied upon it. We rejoice to think that such legislation would now be revolutionary; it would certainly not be novel.

But if he means that our Federal Government has no function but to gather taxes and to keep order, if he means it is not proper for the Federal Government through its departments to enter into such business as may best promote the prosperity and moral and material interests of the people, and that without regard to whether such business may be primarily of some incidental benefit to an individual or a class, then he is not abreast of the spirit of the times.

For years the Government has spent many millions annually, for which it has no hope of being reimbursed, in the improvement of rivers and harbors, and it has not hesitated to continue this expenditure for the general welfare because of the fact

that it involves certain direct benefits to communities, to shipping interests, and to owners of docks and wharves. We have constructed great irrigation works to be sold to settlers at actual cost, and we allow them many years to make payment, yet we do not charge them interest on the investment. We have given away countless acres of the public domain to homesteaders for the purpose of developing our country, encouraging agriculture, and increasing the number of home owners. Yet we do not hear that the direct beneficiaries of these vast gifts from the Government have lost their virility by having had the door of opportunity opened to them by a beneficent Government.

The Government maintains diplomatic and commercial representatives in foreign lands, and no one questions the propriety or the necessity of this service, though its direct primary benefits can go only to travelers, importers, exporters, and those who have investments abroad, the vast majority of the American people being benefited only indirectly. Public opinion has approved the building of the Panama Canal, though some of our citizens will receive from it more direct benefits than others. Public opinion approves the building of the Alaska Railway, though in the development of that great country certain private owners will secure a greater benefit than the rest of us. And now we are proposing to put Government money into the purchase and construction of ships, the operation of which will unquestionably benefit the whole country, but more directly those communities which are situated on the seaboard, those merchants who have foreign connections, and the seamen who may be employed in operating the ships.

But neither foreign trade nor transcontinental transportation nor the development of Alaskan resources is more important or fundamental for this country than the development of agriculture. And if Ambassador Herrick thinks that special legislation and special administrative help is revolutionary or deadening to the spirit of the American farmer, he should read the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture for 1913 and 1914.

Secretary Houston confidently tackles the big problems in the development of our agriculture without too much refinement about "special legislation," "governmental favor," or "deadening spirit." He sees the big things that it is necessary in modern times for a government to do, and proceeds to do them even though the results of his action may be directly to increase the profits of a certain class of our citizenship. It is necessary not only for the Government to procure and disseminate information at considerable cost to the Government and no cost to the farmer, but it is necessary also to use the national resources in the interest of those citizens whose business and location make it possible for them to put such benefits to use. It is sometimes necessary to spend Government money directly to help the agricultural class, and even some individuals of that class. At least it is deemed necessary according to the modern way of looking at things, though the old *laissez-faire* school of government would doubtless have found it more consistent to keep hands off.

I speak now not of theory but of actual accomplishment, reported with justifiable pride and enthusiasm by Secretary Houston. The conclusive justification of Government activity in procuring and disseminating information concerning the preparation of foods is contained in the following words in Secretary Houston's report for 1913:

Savings of waste and economical utilization of products are becoming more and more important; the Government must conduct such investigations, since they are usually so costly that only the larger industrial corporations can undertake them independently. The results obtained by the Government are published for the use of all. The results of private investigation are either kept secret or patented, and thus give an opportunity for monopoly.

Of course when the Secretary says "for the use of all" it must be taken to mean all that class of persons engaged in the preparation of foods. But this primary benefit to a class is distributed to the public generally by competition within that class. This is the sound principle of all the great activities of the Department of Agriculture in gathering and distributing information.

For the distribution of information the department has established the Office of Information for the purpose of preparing brief, popular statements of facts. Of it the annual report says:

This office gathers the facts from the printed material and from typewritten reports and by direct interview with specialists. This material is then prepared in simple news form, mimeographed, and given to papers, particularly in the special districts to which it applies. It is also issued in the form of a weekly letter which is sent to more than 50,000 crop correspondents and progressive farmers.

In this service there is apparently discrimination in favor of "special districts," also in favor of special classes, namely, crop correspondents and farmers, and among farmers discrimination is made between those who are "progressive" and those who are not. Many *finespun* governmental doctrines may apply

to this simple proposition, but the department very sensibly overlooks them and promotes the business in a businesslike way. Such information as it can gather is placed where it will do the most good without regard to the special benefit conferred upon classes or individuals. That it is impossible to secure all the information which might be desired by all of the people in the country and distribute it with absolute equality is not and should not be a reason for failing to supply such practical information as can be secured to the best of the department's ability.

The information secured and distributed to farmers is of considerable variety. The farmer is taught how to manage his farm as a business proposition. Says Secretary Houston:

Important results have been obtained in the study of the cost of producing farm products, the factors which affect the profitability of farm enterprise, and the best way of organizing these enterprises so as to obtain the greatest net income. These studies have also made possible the devising of suitable methods of farm cost accounting for the farmers' use.

Again:

The department is giving special attention to the subject of farm management with the view of rendering to the farmer service similar to that rendered to the business man and the manufacturer by efficiency experts and engineers.

Of course the business man and the manufacturer are in the habit of paying for the service of efficiency experts and engineers, but as their business is ordinarily done on a scale large enough to justify such expense, and as it is in any case the policy of the Government to develop agriculture, it is of course appropriate that the department should supply this service to the farmer free of cost. There is little danger that the conferring of this special benefit to a class will deaden the spirit of the American farmer.

The farmer's wife is taught how to manage the home. Says the report:

The department believes that intelligent help to women in matters of home management will contribute directly to the agricultural success of the farm. It purposes therefore to make more complete studies of domestic conditions on the farm, to experiment with labor-saving devices and methods, and to study completely the question of practical sanitation and hygienic protection for the farm family.

The expenditure of Federal money to improve conditions in the farm home is directly in line with the intelligent development of agriculture.

The beneficent activities of the department are not confined to gathering and distributing information. Property is given to the farmer. To quote:

The distribution of drought-resistant field seeds in the Great Plains area and other dry-land sections of the country has apparently been productive of excellent results.

When it comes to fighting pests and diseases, the department is ready to spend money not only for the farming class as a whole but for the particular class of farmer, or even the individual farmer, who is suffering.

The following shows the good results of direct Federal appropriations for the benefit of cattlemen in the Southern States where cattle ticks have done great damage from Virginia to southern California:

The most effective means of destroying the ticks is by dipping the cattle in an arsenical solution. The success of this work is now only a matter of time and money, and with adequate appropriations the extermination of the ticks can be completed before many years have passed.

The Rocky Mountain potato grower, as well as the southern cattleman, comes in for his share of free Federal service, and the department pathologists have been giving attention to several new diseases of the potato.

Secretary Houston looks with favor on a plan of cooperation between the States and Federal Government by the terms of which Government money shall be expended in the improvement of rural roads.

That Secretary Houston does not hesitate to advocate the Government going into business in competition with private individuals and corporations when there is a public good to be served is shown in the following sentences concerning the department's timber policy:

The national forests must be made to grow all the timber that they can; they must supply the needs of the public at as low cost to the public as possible; and they must be so managed as to protect the public against timber monopoly through private control of stumpage or of the manufacture of lumber. Sales of timber are being aggressively pushed, and the cut is rising yearly. The timber is sold on terms and conditions which safeguard the public against the evils of speculation and monopoly. Full value for the public timber sold for commercial use is obtained, and must be obtained if the Government is not to subsidize those business enterprises which buy the lumber.

Following is a statement of the department's grazing policy, a wise and constructive one, though it might be called paternalistic:

The objects of regulated use of the range for grazing are full use of the resources without injury to timber growth and water flow, the en-

couragement of the live-stock industry, and healthy upbuilding of the West through widely diffused participation in the range privilege by small owners. * * * Developing the industry along lines which contribute to home building and diffuse prosperity shows what true conservation means.

If the Government can issue its notes in response to the financial demands of commerce, it can with equal propriety invest its funds in response to the financial demands of agriculture. If it can use the public range for the healthy upbuilding of the West, to promote home building and diffuse prosperity, surely it can use the public credit for these same objects in the healthy upbuilding of the whole country. If it can go into private business in growing and selling timber in order to safeguard the public against speculation in timber and a monopoly of the Lumber Trust, surely it can take a hand in land-mortgage credits to safeguard the public against speculation in farm lands and the monopoly of the Money Trust.

EFFECT ON NATIONAL CREDIT.

There remains one aspect of the question which I have not yet discussed. It does not require much discussion, since no criticism has been made on this point, and it is altogether likely that none will be. Yet it is fair to inquire whether any possible danger to the national credit lurks in the provisions of this bill. A single comparison will dispose of any fear on that score.

Our national debt is roughly a billion dollars. The French national debt, before the beginning of the present war, was about seven billion dollars. French Government bonds were selling before the war on about a 3½ per cent basis. We have two and one-half times as many people, and many times the national resources that France has. Who will say that our credit is not good for as big a national debt as France can support?

The investment of Treasury funds contemplated by this bill would be only to such an amount as might be necessary to maintain a fair market for the land-bank bonds from time to time, but never to exceed \$50,000,000 in one year. The rate of interest on the bonds would be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board according to the fair value of money in the world market. It would be evidence of bad management if the Federal Reserve Board should authorize the issue of such an amount of land-bank bonds at such a rate of interest as to make it necessary to call on the Treasury for the full fifty millions in any one year. It would prove incompetency if the full amount should be demanded each year for a series of years. It is inconceivable that the full amount could be called for each year for a hundred years. Yet if that should happen, and if during the century it were found impossible to resell any of those bonds, and impossible to raise the funds to buy them other than by borrowing, and if none of the bonds were paid at maturity, then upon the happening of these four contingencies, any one of them practically impossible, it would be necessary in the course of a century to issue \$5,000,000,000 in bonds, and increase our national debt to six billions, still a billion short of the French debt as it stood last summer.

Thus it is clear that, although the credit of our Government could support a bond issue of \$5,000,000,000 in the course of the next century, it is quite impossible that so large an issue would be needed under the provisions of this bill. This conclusion becomes more evidently correct when it is considered that the proposed land-bank bonds would probably have a maturity of 30 years, corresponding to the longest maturity of mortgages authorized, so that if the Government should buy the full fifty millions a year for 30 years it could thereafter continue to buy \$50,000,000 worth of bonds a year forever and pay for them out of the proceeds of the maturing bonds.

It must be remembered, too, that even if the Government should go heavily into debt to buy these bonds, it would certainly have something substantial to show for its investment. The possession of a large quantity of these bonds would be a source of great strength to the Treasury, for the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may on 30 days' notice require the land banks to cease making further investments and to devote their total available receipts above maturing liabilities to the redemption of bonds held by the Government, even before the maturity of such bonds. Thus the Government, having borrowed at low rates in time of financial ease on its own bonds, which have no maturity at all, would have large sums available for immediate use in case of national emergency. And if the land banks were unable to redeem such bonds rapidly enough to meet the needs of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury could exercise the option which the bill gives him to sell land-bank bonds, an operation which he might find more convenient than the issue of new United States bonds in times of national stress. It is clear that the effect of this legislation, so far from being a drain on the Treasury or a strain on the national credit,

will actually prove a very great source of national financial strength.

I have reviewed our reasons for proposing Government aid in the particular form in which we have proposed it—the theory of it, the precedent for it, the experience justifying it, its practicability, and its effect on the Government credit. My argument on that point is ended.

THE NEED FOR FARM-CREDIT LEGISLATION.

Now, just a few words on the need of farm-credit legislation. A year ago it was admitted by all. There seems now to be a disposition in some quarters to give the impression that the Federal reserve act will provide all the additional credit facilities that the farmer needs. It will not.

Secretary Houston's report elaborates somewhat on the benefits which he says that the Federal reserve act will give the farmer. Doubtless the rediscount facilities afforded by the Federal reserve act to national and other member banks, and the eligibility for rediscount of six months' notes drawn against farm products will, to some extent, ease the short-time credit situation for the farmer. The farmer will not fail to understand, however, that only a very small proportion of his total investment is represented by agricultural products which can be sold inside of six months to meet a six months' note drawn against them. He will not fail to contrast his situation in this respect with that of the city merchant, who probably has no capital tied up in his place of business, which may be established in rented quarters, and whose stock in trade may be represented by goods which remain in his possession less than 90 days, and can therefore be financed by notes which are rediscountable under the terms of the Federal reserve act. The merchant can make rediscountable paper for almost his entire investment; the farmer can make rediscountable paper for only a very small fraction of his investment.

The provision in the Federal reserve act permitting certain national banks to lend on farm lands for not to exceed five years may help the farmer to some extent. But it is not likely that the national banks will largely avail themselves of this privilege, as they know that it is not good banking to tie up in a long-term investment money which they may be called upon to pay on demand. Furthermore, commercial banks will generally find short loans, and consequent frequent compounding of interest more profitable than mortgage loans. The aggregate amount which can be loaned by a national bank on farm lands under the terms of the Federal reserve act is only one-fourth of its capital and surplus or one-third of its time deposits, whichever of the two is smaller. A bank having no time deposits could make no such loans at all, no matter how great its capital and surplus, and a bank with \$40,000 capital and surplus could loan on farm lands but \$10,000, no matter how great its time deposits. Under these limitations, even if the national banks were anxious to make as many farm loans as possible, which they are not, they could not take care of 10 per cent of the farm-loan business of the United States.

But the fact is that the Federal reserve act scarcely touches the need of agricultural land-mortgage credit at all. What we need in this country, and have not, is a system for long-time mortgages. Five years is ordinarily too short a time in which to expect to repay indebtedness incurred in the purchase or permanent improvement of farm lands. The Federal reserve act may help the farmer in certain classes of credit to which he already had access, but it has no application at all to the long-time mortgage, of which the farmer stands in need.

Secretary Houston's report says that the people of the United States have ampler financial agencies than any elsewhere in the world, and have greatly developed the habit of using these agencies. The farmer will be interested to know this. But the farmer also knows that he is paying higher interest rates than the European or Australian farmer, and that long-time mortgage credit is not available to him at all as it is to his foreign competitor. The President presented the situation with the right perspective a year ago when he said:

We must add the means by which the farmer may make his credit constantly and easily available, and command when he will the capital by which to support and expand his business. We lag behind many other great countries of the modern world in attempting to do this. Systems of rural credits have been studied and developed on the other side of the water, while we left our farmers to shift for themselves in the ordinary money market. You have but to look about you in any rural district to see the result, the handicap and embarrassment which have been placed upon those who produce our food.

To meet this urgent need your subcommittee has prepared a bill which is in the nature of a compromise of many conflicting views. It accords with the experience of the world and with the views of practically all of the witnesses who came before the subcommittee. It has been substantially indorsed by the National Grange, as will appear from certain resolutions and

reports which I shall ask leave to have printed with my speech. It has not been directly challenged in public on any vital point during a period of seven months since it has been made public, either in Congress or elsewhere, and I challenge any who oppose it to criticize it now.

All political parties have promised the farmer that the credit machinery peculiarly adapted to his business shall be provided. He knows that it is as much a Government function to do whatever may be necessary to provide him with adequate credit facilities as it is to teach him how to manage his farm and his wife how to manage her kitchen, which Secretary Houston is already doing. This great responsibility can not be evaded by saying, as the Secretary says, that "the American farmer is sturdy, independent, and self-reliant." These compliments could have been bestowed on the cave man who lived in bygone ages. The American farmer of to-day deserves not only these compliments, but one more which the cave man did not deserve—he is intelligent. [Applause.] And he knows that when a promise is made to him it should be fulfilled. [Applause.]

The President does not dispose of the shipping question by telling the importers and exporters that they are "sturdy, independent, and self-reliant." What would they think of him if he did? They are as well able to find ships for themselves as the farmer is to find credit for himself. True the ships they would find for themselves would not be conveniently adequate to their purposes, and would cost high, but that is true also of the credit which the farmer finds for himself. Yet the President does not propose to leave our men of commerce to shift for themselves, to depend on foreigners or profit-seeking capitalists to furnish vessels. He promptly proposes that the Government do what is necessary to put the American flag on the seas for the benefit of American commerce. This policy will bring trade and dollars to our land. Now, let the Government also do what is necessary to put the American farmer on his own farm. This will bring us dollars, too, and, better yet, will promote the prosperity and insure the independent ownership of millions of American farm homes, now and in the years to come. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, referring to matters that occurred in the House on yesterday afternoon when the chairman of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee was addressing the Members, I wish to say that when interrupting the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], I had no intention of reflecting on the integrity or conduct of any Member of this body on either side. The special rule which was up for consideration had been presented to this body at the request of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, the Postmaster General, and the administration, and the Committee on Rules was only carrying out what it deemed to be its duty in presenting that rule. The previous question had been ordered on the rule by unanimous consent. A roll call was being had, and after voting I had gone to the restaurant and the barber shop and only returned just as the call was being completed, and was not personally cognizant of what was transpiring. The special rule in regard to railway mail pay embodied in the bill only what had been passed through the House at the last session of Congress practically by unanimous consent, and I had supposed that there was no objection to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, surely I did not have any wish to reflect on any Member, for I did not know how any Member of this House had voted on the special rule except myself, and presumed that practically all had voted for it, because the previous question had been ordered by unanimous consent. I thought the House was entitled to the information that came to me as chairman, and only interposed for the purpose of saying that much to my colleagues without meaning to criticize or disparage any Member. I would not appear now and read the telegrams to the committee were it not for the fact that my statements seemed to be challenged, and I stated that I would read the telegrams to this body. I did not show these telegrams to any member of the committee because I had thought another course would dispose finally of the matter, and such action was not necessary or important. Here is one telegram that came to me the night before the committee met and was sent to me at my residence:

PENNSYLVANIA STATION,
New York, December 15, 1914.

Hon. R. L. HENRY,
Chairman Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of 264 leading railroads, representing nearly 90 per cent of the mileage of the United States, I would respectfully ask that you grant a hearing to our committee on the application of House Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to make new legislation in order on appropriation bill which practically embodies the provisions of

House bill 7042, which has already passed the House and is now pending before Senate committee. We earnestly protest against this legislation, and beg for an opportunity to be heard on the subject.

RALPH PETERS,
Chairman Committee on Railway Mail Pay.

Here is another telegram from San Francisco, Cal., dated December 16, 1914, coming to my residence:

Hon. R. L. HENRY,
Chairman Committee on Rules,
1825 Nineteenth Street, Washington, D. C.:

This association, comprising short important railroads of 11 Western States, respectfully protests against your honorable committee ruling to make Moon bill proper legislation as part of Post Office appropriation bill without giving this association an opportunity to be heard on the Moon bill, which vitally concerns us, and which hearing we respectfully request at an early date.

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF SHORT LINE RAILWAYS,
By D. M. SWOBE.

Here is another, from Valdosta, Ga., dated December 16, 1914:

Hon. R. L. HENRY,
Chairman Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of membership of Short Line Railroad Association of Southeast we respectfully urge that your committee do not make special rule making Moon bill proper legislation as part of Post Office appropriation bill, which House Committee on Post Offices has so included. We also respectfully request that you grant short lines hearing before passing upon this rule. Answer at our expense.

J. W. OGLESBY, President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. HENRY. Here is another telegram:

NEW YORK, December 16, 1914.

Hon. R. L. HENRY,
Chairman Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Will you kindly grant this association a hearing on the proposed special rule to embody the Moon bill in the Post Office appropriation bill?

SHORT LINE RAILROAD ASSOCIATION,
60 Wall Street, New York City.

Mr. Chairman, these telegrams came to me as chairman of the Committee on Rules; and inasmuch as this legislation had been passed before, and inasmuch as I thought there could be no opposition to this special rule in the House of Representatives on either side, being, as I remember it, a unanimous report of the committee, I did not see any necessity for going into these things further than stating the general terms of the rule.

Answering these telegrams, I did not reply by wire, because I did not have time. They came the night before the committee was to meet; but here is one of my replies, and the others were strictly in line with it:

Mr. J. W. OGLESBY, Valdosta, Ga.

MY DEAR SIR: Permit me to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram in regard to the legislation proposed to be incorporated in the Moon bill. The committee did not deem it wise to have a hearing on this subject, inasmuch as the Post Office Committee had asked for the rule and it was thought proper to grant their request.

Very truly, yours,

R. L. HENRY.

On the day the committee met to act on the special rule, two gentlemen who claimed to represent railroads came to the Committee on Rules, and sent word to me as chairman of that committee that they wished a hearing before the committee. Judge Moon was in my office at the time, and he and I were conferring about it. I sent word out to these gentlemen that a hearing was unnecessary and would amount to nothing, because, in my judgment, the Committee on Rules would promptly acquiesce in the request of the chairman of the Post Office Committee, the Postmaster General, and the administration, and that any time given them would be lost and it would be useless to grant them a hearing. I will say that I sent word to my clerk by the messenger to take the names of these gentlemen and their addresses, so that if it became necessary to confer with them I could communicate with them later. One of those gentlemen left his name, stating that it was Mack, and that he was at the Raleigh Hotel, and that he represented the International & Great Northern Railroad. The other gentleman left his name, which was misplaced, but stated to the clerk, so the clerk informs me, that he represented the Southern Pacific Railway system, and wanted a hearing to protest against this special rule.

All that I said yesterday was that the only protests coming to the chairman of the Committee on Rules or to the Committee on Rules, as far as I knew, came from the railroads. When I said that, thinking I was stating a fact my colleagues would gladly hear and wanted to know, without meaning to impugn the motives or the conduct of any Representative about his vote on the rule, because it was personally immaterial to me, and I did not know how anyone voted except myself.

Mr. HEFLIN. Will my friend yield to me?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Then my friend from Texas did not intend by anything that he said to sanction the abuse by the gentleman from Tennessee of Democratic Members who voted against the rule?

Mr. HENRY. I say I did not intend to reflect on any Member, expressly or by implication, and, not knowing all that had transpired in my absence, was giving the information to my colleagues. I would rather discuss my own motives and my own conduct, without trying to construe what some one else said. I was speaking for myself and for no one else.

Mr. HEFLIN. But the gentleman from Tennessee was very severe in his speech, and I think his remarks were unfounded and unwarranted from every viewpoint.

Mr. HENRY. I would rather that my colleague from Tennessee would take up that matter with him, because I did not hear all of the gentleman's speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I could answer the gentleman from Alabama. The remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee on that occasion were not abusive of anybody. The gentleman from Tennessee said expressly upon this floor that he did not undertake to say that any man on this floor was controlled by the railroads, the postmasters, or anybody else. He said expressly that he did not charge corruption to anybody; and he said further, and he says it now, that the facts and circumstances connected with the whole transaction, the part that certain gentlemen have played in votes and otherwise, left the impression upon my mind—and I had a right to express that impression to this House, whether it agreed with it or not—that there were some influences that prevented the adoption of this rule recommended by the administration, the Post Office Committee, and the Committee on Rules. The gentleman did not undertake to say that that was railroad influence. He simply asked the question, if you will see the RECORD, "Was it the influence of the carriers, was it the influence of the postmasters, or was it the influence of the railroad companies?" I do not care what influenced you, whether it is one of those three things or something else. I said, and say yet, it was a most egregious error not to give the rule that would save this country \$10,000,000.

Mr. HEFLIN. But the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield—

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS). The gentleman from Tennessee has control of the time and has the floor.

Mr. MOON. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. Characterized Members as craven cowards, and referred to those who went down to the Clerk's desk and changed their votes. I was one of that number to go to the Clerk's desk and change my vote, because I voted wrong in the outset. If I understood the proposition correctly—and we had not time to get an explanation about it—the only way we could have the matter reopened was to defeat that rule, and then let another rule come in, so we could have an understanding about it. The gentleman from Tennessee lost his temper and made a severe arraignment of the Democrats on this side who did not vote with him, and the arraignment was printed in the RECORD to-day, which was another mistake made by the gentleman from Tennessee. [Laughter on the Republican side.] And I state, as one of those who made the change, that no railroad influenced me, and I have heard of no railroad influence on this floor; and the gentleman ought not to make a charge of that kind unless he can prove it.

Mr. MOON. What did influence the gentleman?

Mr. HEFLIN. And I can not believe that any Member who changed his vote was influenced by any railroad.

Mr. MOON. I want the gentleman from Alabama to understand that I gave three reasons which appeared to me might actuate gentlemen in changing their votes. If neither one of those actuated the gentleman, what was the reason?

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not want to injure the mail service as now carried on by the rural carriers. [Applause.] I did not want to injure the third and fourth class postmasters, and I did not want to injure the Railway Mail Service, either, in the United States. [Applause.] I am not an enemy of the railroads. I am the friend of every legitimate industry and enterprise in this country; and the Democratic Party is not the enemy of legitimate railroad business. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Nobody said it was.

Mr. HEFLIN. Now, the gentleman on yesterday, piqued because this rule was defeated, was unjustified and unwarranted from every viewpoint in arraigning the Democrats on this side [applause], who are as good Democrats as live, and not only that, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN. It does not lie within the mouth of my good friend to question my Democracy or that of other Democrats in this House. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Just a moment. The gentleman from Alabama is speaking in the time and with the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was very much in hopes, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Tennessee—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield further?

Mr. MOON. I will yield two minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. HEFLIN. I was very much in hopes, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Tennessee, for whom I have always had a warm personal friendship, would follow the course of my good friend from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who stated to this House that he did not mean to reflect in any way upon the integrity or honor of any Democrat who dared to vote against him on yesterday. I had hoped that the gentleman from Tennessee would pursue that course and say to the country, as the gentleman from Texas said, that no Democrat who went down there and changed his vote on yesterday was susceptible to sinister influences in this House. [Applause.] I do not believe that any Democrat who dared to go down and change his vote that he believed was wrong ought to be characterized as the gentleman from Tennessee characterized us on yesterday, and I thought that after the gentleman from Tennessee had time to think deliberately over what he had said that he would not print that speech in the Record against men in this House who ought not to have aspersions of that sort cast upon them by him or anybody else. [Applause.] The Democratic Party has had such a record for clean dealing and for honest work in the open that I did not think the gentleman from Tennessee would arraign his party without warrant as he has done in this House. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman did not answer my questions. He did not say what influenced him.

Mr. HEFLIN. I just stated—

Mr. MOON. He did not say whether it was the postmasters or the rural carriers or the railroads, but he dodged the question and said he did not want to injure any industry in this country, and so on. Does not the gentleman know that he could have voted for the rule and then have voted down anything under it, which was necessary? Does not the gentleman know that the main feature of this bill, the only great feature in it, is the railroad proposition, and does he not know that when he voted as he did he voted against the consideration of that railroad proposition that would save this country eight millions of dollars every year, if carried? I have no desire to reflect, and I have not reflected, as this speech shows, if it is carefully read, on the integrity of anybody. In order that we may be sure, listen to what I said, after I had time and again said what I did say:

I do not know—I would not undertake to say, and I have not said, that the railroads have brought any direct influence upon any Member of this House.

That was said in the body of the speech, and that it might be certain—

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Wait one moment—that it might be certain, I said at the end:

I charge no man with corruption, but with most egregious error when, intentionally or not, he permits himself to appear and act in opposition to the best interest of his party and country.

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HAMLIN. I am not one of those who changed his vote yesterday, but on that point I want to direct the gentleman's attention to a remark that he made in that speech.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman must take that speech as a whole, and not separately.

Mr. HAMLIN. I notice the gentleman says:

I do not care whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. Shall the letters "R. I."—railroad influence—be branded on his brow when he goes back to his constituency and tells them that he would not consider a question under which their rights might be protected?

Mr. MOON. Yes; I said that, and I say that now.

Mr. HAMLIN. Then the gentleman says just what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] says he did say.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not apologize for anything I did say. That is put in the form of a question. I asked the question "Shall it be done?" You must answer that question yourself. I will not. I have not said that it was true that that influence existed. Upon the contrary, I disclaimed that, but I am not going to retreat one single inch. I have no apologies to make for one single word that was uttered here yesterday. You

did put yourselves in a bad attitude. I do not say that you were corrupt, and I do not believe that you were, but you put yourselves in an attitude you ought not to have put yourselves in, and you are entitled to the censure that you received.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman said:

Gentlemen, like craven cowards—

Mr. MOON. Oh, the gentleman stated that a while ago.

Mr. HEFLIN (continuing)—

destroying every vestige of respect that a decent Democrat should have, follow the lead of the Republican Party, repudiate the Democratic President, the Democratic Postmaster General, the Democratic Rules Committee, and the Democratic Post Office Committee of this House, for what?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. DONOVAN. There is not a quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there is a quorum present. Gentlemen of the committee will be seated. The Sergeant at Arms will see that Members take their seats.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Just let the committee come to order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I raise the question of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point is not well taken. The Chair thinks there is a quorum present. In the Committee of the Whole only 100 are required to make a quorum, and the Chair thinks there are 100 Members present. The Sergeant at Arms will see that Members take their seats. The committee will be in order. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, it is immaterial to me what the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] thinks about this or anything else. He has a right to his own judgment upon the facts of this case and I have a right to mine. I said, and I say now, and I do not propose to withdraw one single word of it from anybody, that, in my opinion, when the President of the United States and the Postmaster General, when the Democratic Committee on Rules, when the Democratic Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads asks for a rule to consider legislation that would save to this country millions of dollars, then the Democrat who turns his back upon that request, the Democrat who turns his back upon that demand, violates the best interests of the Democratic Party, and I do not care whether that Democrat comes from Alabama or anywhere else.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, the language of the gentleman—

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to say that the President asked for this rule—demanded it?

Mr. MOON. Oh, the President did not go before the committee and ask for the rule; but the President did this: He approved the action of the Postmaster General in doing it, as I am advised by the Postmaster General.

Mr. COOPER. Did the President approve of putting the Rural Free Delivery System of this country under the contract system? If he did, then you will never have another Democratic President.

Mr. MOON. I do not know whether the President approved that or not, and that is not the question here.

Mr. COOPER. It is in your rule.

Mr. GORDON. It is not.

Mr. COOPER. It was in the rule yesterday.

Mr. GORDON. It was not.

Mr. MOON. The only question is whether the legislation shall be in order.

That issue was not before you. The rule was provided to make that in order. And I am going to say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that under the terms of the rule that was asked for here the rural carriers of the United States have secured \$100 additional compensation, and when you voted against the rule yesterday every man who voted against it voted against the proposition in that bill that would give the rural letter carriers the maximum pay, considering only distance and not weights and number of packages.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIBBLE. Then a vote against the rule makes that additional appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the increased pay of rural carriers subject to a point of order; that is to say, the rule would keep the increased pay in the bill, and if a point of

order is made and no rule to protect it, then it goes out on a point of order? Is that the correct parliamentary situation as to the increased pay of rural carriers?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if the Postmaster General and the President also requested that this item of the increase of rural carriers be included in the rule?

Mr. MOON. No; that was put in the rule by the committee without the request of either the President or the Postmaster General.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. I would like to ask one other question.

Mr. MOON. I mean to say that administrative legislation was demanded generally by the Postmaster General. The President approved the railway proposition, and so did the Postmaster General, as I am advised. I never talked to the President on the subject and do not know what he thinks personally.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. One other question.

Mr. MOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. As to the provision affecting the weighing of mails and thereby affecting the railroad companies, I understood the gentleman in his speech on yesterday to make the statement that this would save the Government several millions of dollars?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. If that is true, will the gentleman state in his judgment whether or not that provision is subject to a point of order in this bill?

Mr. MOON. Yes; I think it is subject to a point of order, because it is entirely new law, and it does not show a saving upon its face, and can not do it, but only shows an administrative proposition of saving. The saving will occur, as the department thinks, in the handling of the mails. In other words, you have changed from the quadrennial weighing of the mails on a weight basis, on which the pay is to be computed, to the space provision, and you will have enough space under the contract to carry all your parcel post probably without any additional compensation and save many million dollars annually. That is their theory.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Does the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. The gentleman took occasion to arraign many of us on this side of the House—

Mr. MOON. I did not call anybody's name.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. Neither did I call anybody's name. I said many of us. I mean those who voted against the special rule on yesterday. I think the gentleman can not deny that.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. PAGE of North Carolina. He arraigned us on the ground that we were opposing a policy which the President very much wanted and on the ground that we were not in favor of proper economy in governmental affairs. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he did not, when the President did recommend very specifically and urged within the knowledge of practically all the membership of the House his interest in the passage of the Alaskan bill, refuse to follow the mandates of the President.

Mr. MOON. I did. I do not ask you to follow it where you were able to get on the floor and justify your opposition to it. I simply said in all questions of administrative propositions connected with these departments and the economies there it was wise for the legislative branch to follow the Executive where they could conscientiously do so. If you will read that speech, you will see in that same connection that I said I did not favor any subservience to the Executive, that I would oppose, as I have done on this floor, the position of the Executive on the civil-service matter or any other matter of principle, but I do think that you ought to give some respect to the head of the Government and the departments when they are asking you simply for legislation, administrative and economic in its character and involving no question of principle upon which you might properly differ.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to me for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I believe, in answer to the question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE], you stated that none of the economies recommended by the department could be brought up for consideration; that they would be subject

to a point of order, and would not come under the Holman rule, because the economies do not appear affirmatively in the bill?

Mr. MOON. That is true as to many of them.

Mr. HOWARD. Now, then, under the present situation there were \$2,000,000 that were to go to the rural carriers which is subject to a point of order, is it not?

Mr. MOON. I think so.

Mr. HOWARD. And the \$100 additional which they would have gotten if the rule had been adopted will be withheld from them if anybody makes the point of order?

Mr. MOON. I think so. I think if gentlemen who want to help the rural carriers based their opposition to the rule on the fact that the rule did not benefit them, they will find if they read it that they were mistaken.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Tennessee yield to the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does the gentleman think he was justified—

Mr. MOON. Now, if you are going back to that speech, I want to say to you that it is a matter of opinion. I stated the facts as I understand them and the inferences I drew from them, and if I had not thought I was justified I would not have done so. Of course I think I was justified. I do not charge you with dishonesty or corruption, or anything of that sort, but I do charge you with the very worst party judgment that any lot of men ever had in the world. [Laughter.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I merely want to ask the gentleman if he did not go too far? And I want to say to the gentleman that he is not charging anything against me, because I did not vote against it.

Mr. MOON. Well, then, what have you got to do with it? [Laughter.]

Mr. RAGSDALE. I have this to do with it, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOON. Well, ask your question. Do not go into a speech.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I will ask it if I am permitted.

Mr. MOON. Go ahead and ask it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. I believe, Mr. Chairman, I have this much to do with it as a Democrat, that when this gentleman charges that there is railroad influence enough on this side of the House to defeat this legislation, I, as a Democrat, do not believe it, and I repudiate it, sir. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Well, now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina has expressed himself, and he has given his opinion, and I am entirely willing that this House shall take it for just what it is worth. [Laughter.] I do not want to offend anybody in this House. That is not my habit. I have never said anything against a Democrat or Republican that was intended to be unkind. I have given the facts and have drawn the inferences from them. "Is it the hit dog that yelps or not?" [Laughter and applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] can proceed.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have five minutes in which to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will have to get time from the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] or the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman from North Carolina desire to make a statement?

Mr. WEBB. Yes; I want to make a statement.

Mr. MOON. Very well. Go ahead. I yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. WEBB. Five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I think all of this business has been quite a tempest in a teapot. I do not think that Judge Moon intended to reflect upon the Members who voted against his rule yesterday. I know how men feel after losing a battle either in the courthouse or on this floor. At such times they say things that they do not really mean. They are at such times intemperate in speech. I acquit Judge Moon of what his speech would be understood to imply as to the motives of Democrats—60 of them—who did not vote for the special rule yesterday.

When I came in on the floor of the House yesterday I had been down at the department attending to some official business, and I asked some fellow Member what the rule was. He said, "It is a rule that the Committee on Rules has reported," and I voted "aye." Immediately two colleagues of mine said to me, "Look here, WEBB, that rule is 'loaded.' There are 37 pages of it, and it has not even been read in the House by the Clerk. There is a lot of 'dynamite' in it, and you ought not to vote for it." I said, "I do not know about that. I am afraid you are like a lot of cattle, being stampeded; but yielding to your judgment, since you have heard the discussion, and to be agreeable, I will change my vote." [Laughter and applause.] So I went down and changed my vote, as also did about 30 or 40 of my colleagues. But the truth is I did not know a single syllable that the rule contained, and I do not suppose any other Member knew all the rule contained, unless it was the members of the Post Office and Post Roads Committee and the Rules Committee. I doubt if one out of ten Members even now know what the rule contained. All Members, in the stress of their numerous duties, must rely on their colleagues in a measure as to casting their vote, especially when one has not had the time to investigate fully a subject for himself. I voted against the rule because my colleagues—KITCHIN and PAGE and GUDGER and DOUGHTON—true and loyal men, noble representatives of a noble people, had voted that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as the railroad influence is concerned, my friend from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] knows that railroad influences did not touch the hearts or the minds of a single man who voted yesterday against that rule. I do not believe he himself really thinks that they did it on that account. If the men who voted against the rule yesterday were controlled by railroad influences, and a majority of the House did so vote, they ought to be kicked out of the House; and if Judge Moon makes the charge that they were controlled by railroad influences, and it is not so, then Judge Moon ought to resign as chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads or apologize to the House. [Applause.] I say that in absolute kindness, because Judge Moon and I have been good friends for a long time and are good friends yet.

I remember the time when Judge Moon felt it to be his duty to vote with 23 Democrats who supported Mr. Cannon; but I know that Judge Moon is an honest man and a courageous man, with positive views, and a man who has the courage to express them. For a long time the country wanted a parcel post and I wanted it. It was understood that Judge Moon was opposed to it. Yet I never said that the express companies owned or controlled Judge Moon. I would not say that for the world. I do not believe it is so. I believe in charity to my fellow man and to honest Members who differ from me.

Now I want to come back to where I started, and repeat that I do not think that Judge Moon really meant it when he intimated yesterday that the 60 men here who voted against the rule were controlled by railroad influences. The language is harsh.

I do not believe Judge Moon meant that. So far as I am concerned, it just so happens that I never voted with the railroads in my life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. WEBB. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have three minutes more. Not 1 Member out of 10, I venture to assert, even knew the railway weighing measure was included in the rule. I voted for this identical measure the 11th of last August, and the bill is now in the Senate and I am still for it.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for three minutes more.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. WEBB. Certainly.

Mr. OGLESBY. Would not the gentleman vote for the railroads if he thought the railroads were right?

Mr. WEBB. I would; but it so happens in my public career that I did not think they were right on the issues presented in the State senate and in this House. We had a fight for eight years on the floor of this House over the Southern Railroad mail subsidy. This road runs through my district and carried this subsidized mail to it. They ran two magnificent trains, Nos. 37 and 97, and the subsidy was about \$142,000 a year to those two trains; and every year when the appropriation bill came up I voted against that subsidy, and I was criticized on account of my vote by some of my friends. No railroad or railroad agent ever asked me to vote against a single provision in

the 37-page rule, and I do not believe that 1 per cent of the 60 good Democrats who voted against it even knew that the railway weighing provision was in the rule.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the opportunity of making this statement. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I want to put my friend right in regard to these matters. Does he know who made the report that started the fight on the railroad subsidy that he speaks of?

Mr. WEBB. I do not know, sir. I think the fight was on when I came to Congress.

Mr. MOON. I will inform the gentleman that I made the first motion to strike out the subsidy, and the first report against it, and I followed it to the end.

Mr. WEBB. I followed the gentleman and voted with him on that.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman said I voted with 23 Democrats who supported Mr. Cannon. The gentleman ought to know better than that. Mr. FITZGERALD, a Democrat in this House, offered the resolution containing the rules for which I voted with 23 Democrats. That was in the Sixty-first Congress. What happened? In the Sixty-second Congress the Democratic Party rejected the proposition of the majority in the previous Congress to leave the question of the determination of the rules to 15 men, 9 from one side and 6 from the other. I had opposed the proposition that 9 Republicans and 6 Democrats should settle and determine the destinies of the Democratic Party in the Sixty-first Congress. What did the Democrats do in the Sixty-second Congress? They adopted the old rules that had existed for many years—and it was a wise thing to do, because they were sensible rules—except they accepted and made a part of the new rules the identical four propositions that those 23 Democrats voted for, and they added one other rule, that took the Speaker from the Rules Committee; so that in that Congress the action of the 23 Democrats was vindicated by the unanimous vote of the Democratic Party. And so it happened again in this Congress, and you have no other rules here—save one, taking the Speaker from the Committee on Rules—except the Republican rules and the rules proposed by those 23 Democrats. [Applause.]

Mr. WEBB. Will my friend permit an interruption?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. WEBB. I am not criticizing the gentleman's course—whether he is right or wrong.

Mr. MOON. You did criticize it.

Mr. WEBB. No, no.

Mr. MOON. You had the notion that I was wrong, and I had the notion that you were wrong, and you criticized me.

Mr. WEBB. I did not express the opinion that you were wrong, but I expressed the idea that your efforts were charitable; and I did not charge you with betraying—

Mr. MOON. Oh, every Democrat, and you among them, went into a solemn convention and denounced us for our vote on the Fitzgerald rule—every single one of you—and then you came back in the next Congress and adopted every one of those rules.

Mr. WEBB. I do not remember any such convention as that.

Mr. MOON. Yes, you did, at your meeting—your caucus. I have not forgotten it.

Mr. WEBB. I have not joined in any such denunciation. I did not mean to bring up the merits of the rule question.

Mr. MOON. Those things were done. All the gentlemen around me know that the majority of the Democratic Party in caucus assembled denounced the 23 men and established for the first time the caucus proposition instead of the consent agreement that had theretofore applied.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. HOWARD. I know my dear, good friend thinks that the remedy being applied is worse than the ailment.

Mr. MOON. Oh, I am not complaining of that now. I am just answering the suggestion of my friend WEBB against me.

Mr. HOWARD. Did you not think that?

Mr. MOON. They published an address against us, as my friend sitting beside me [Mr. CLARK] reminds me, and they issued it to the country. Then you took up our wisdom, every word of it, and had no wisdom to add to it. [Applause.]

Mr. HOWARD. I think my friend misunderstood me.

Mr. MOON. I beg to be excused from going into that any further. I am in the very best of humor. My friend said that I was supposed to be against the parcel post. I was supposed to, and did, propose to give very careful consideration to that proposition, and not rush into that legislation until I had information in reference to it, just as I am about this railroad

proposition now. But when all the facts were before us, when the time for action came, go and look at your record and see who introduced the parcel-post proposition that became the law. I introduced the proposition in the Post Office appropriation bill; and then, seeing the temper of this House, that we might go further than the mere rural delivery, I offered a substitute on the floor of this House for the proposition I had in the bill. That substitute was adopted by this House, and the bill went to the Senate, and the provisions of the House and Senate bill were combined by Senator Bourne and myself in the conference report that was adopted, and that is the parcel-post law of the United States to-day. [Applause.] Yet the gentleman takes these two things as rather suspicious against me. Well, I said, and it is not necessary for me to keep repeating it, but I want to assure this House that in that speech yesterday I was expressing, as I always try to express, my calm judgment upon all the facts and circumstances as presented. I did not care what influence you were ruled by, or whether there was any. I suggested three influences. If those were not the things that controlled you, you can tell us what did.

Now my friend pleads ignorance of the facts. Ignorance of the law excuses no man.

The gentleman says he was ignorant as to the provisions of the law. I want to make an exception of the general rule and to give the benefit to the gentleman from North Carolina and to all the other gentlemen who voted that way, because you were ignorant beyond all question or you would not have done it. [Laughter.] I am going to excuse you in that which the law will not do on account of your ignorance. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of pouring oil on the troubled waters of the Democratic sea. Far be it from me to restrain any of the gentlemen on the other side when they are disposed to tell each other just what they think of each other. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The only real regret I have in the matter is that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] saw fit to somewhat tone down his very caustic remarks of yesterday before he printed them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. And yet I am inclined to think that this is true. A great many years ago a great man is recorded as having said, "I said in my haste, 'All men are liars.'" It is not recorded that David in his sober moments, unmoved by haste or anger, ever laid that sweeping indictment against his fellow men.

Without any knowledge of what motives may have actuated gentlemen on the other side in their rather precipitate transfer of their votes before the roll call ended yesterday, I am at least inclined to think that after the sting of defeat has passed the gentleman from Tennessee will be inclined as he now, indeed, seems inclined, to considerably modify his very caustic and sweeping statement relative to his fellow Members on the Democratic side. He knows them better than we do, and he ought to be accurate in his speech in regard to them, even in moments of anger and defeat.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose, however, was to transfer the debate from this atmosphere of crimination and recrimination, of charges and countercharges, to the clear, pure, atmosphere of the western plains and mountains, to discuss a matter which may be of interest to gentlemen who voted on both sides of the rule yesterday. Assuming as I do—and I think accurately—that the vote on the rule was largely influenced by reason of the fact that it tended to affect, or the legislation it made in order would affect, the policy under which we have been operating in the carrying of the rural mails.

Out in the western country, particularly the mountainous West, we have not had to any considerable extent the benefit of rural delivery. There are only 14 rural routes in my State of nearly a hundred thousand square miles. We get along there with star routes. Now that the Postmaster General has suggested a change from the present system of annual salaries to rural carriers to the system of contracts, which is the rule under the star routes, it may be somewhat interesting to discuss the conditions where star-route service is the more important postal service. It is unfortunate for the star-route service that it has been so largely supplanted and overshadowed by the Rural Delivery Service that there are comparatively few Members of Congress interested in it. While we have seen the pay of the rural carriers increased year after year, until their average pay is more than twice what it was when the service was first inaugurated, the pay of the star-route carrier has advanced comparatively little.

It is perhaps natural that the Postmaster General, desiring to economize in his service, desires to modify a system that

has so constantly increased in cost and bring it more in harmony with the star-route system, under which the Government secures service for much less money than it pays for a like service under rural routes.

This bill carries an appropriation of \$9,000,000 for the star routes. That is an increase of \$325,000 over the appropriation of last year. In my opinion it is not sufficient.

I have been calling attention to the fact that these star-route appropriations were inadequate for years. This is an annual speech of mine. I have on several occasions secured increases above the estimate. I shall offer an amendment above this estimate, and I think I shall be able to demonstrate that that increase is necessary if in the western and sparsely settled portions of the country we are to have a mail service such as American citizens, wherever they may be located, are entitled to.

There are more than 11,000 star routes in the country. For a considerable number of years, with the spread and extension of the rural system the number of star routes was constantly diminishing. The pendulum is somewhat swinging the other way at this time, and the number of star routes has increased in the last six months by something like 50. The probability is that if the service is reasonably cared for, if the people of the sparsely settled sections of the country are given any sort of reasonable mail facilities there will be an increase at least of several hundred routes in the coming fiscal year. There are at least a score of routes in my State now asked for that ought to be established in addition to the abandoned routes that should be reestablished.

I do not desire to unfairly criticize the postal authorities in connection with this matter. I realize that in their proper desire to economize within reason in the Postal Service they find it a little difficult sometimes to bring themselves to a frame of mind which they feel would justify the authorization of service at a very considerable increase of cost above the service of the past. I am not, however, able to understand why they object to retaining as good a service as the people have had in the past.

The fact is that the western mountainous country has, as to some of its communities, rather been injured than otherwise by the establishment of the parcel post, and in this way: The establishment of the parcel post necessarily increases the cost of star routes. The department desires to economize, and is not disposed to grant these necessary increases. The Postmaster General estimates a surplus of receipts over expenditures for the last fiscal year of somewhere between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000. This report indicates that the excess is over \$4,000,000, but the Postmaster General in his report places it at something more than \$3,000,000.

Now, this is a very excellent showing and ought to be approved by all providing it is not obtained at the expense of the service, and providing it is not the result of economies which deny American citizens postal facilities to which they are entitled. I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that while you are having a considerable amount of disagreement as to whether or not rural carriers are to have their pay still further increased, there are a large number of people under the American flag in the western country that have no mail facilities at all.

We are putting in refrigerators down here in the post office in this city to care for perishable goods transported by the Postal Service. We are providing in many villages of small population for house-to-house delivery, and yet the Post Office Department is denying very considerable communities in my State and in other Western States postal facilities of any kind, except such as they secure under what is known as special service, which is no provision at all. The Postal Service is not justified in claiming credit for a surplus of revenues over expenditures when it does not maintain the Postal Service in as satisfactory condition as it has been maintained in the past. I have a list of 11 star routes in my State that have been operated from 5 to 30 years prior to July 1 last that are now abandoned, and the people living along those routes and at the end of some of them around the post offices have now no mail delivery at all at any time except as they provide for it and pay for it themselves. The condition in Wyoming is not dissimilar from that in other Western States. Wyoming is Republican in its representation, and some people have been unkind enough to the Post Office Department to suggest that possibly we would do better in the matter of star routes if our delegation in Congress was of a different political faith. In my opinion there is no ground or basis for such a criticism, because the conditions of which I complain are no more acute in my State than they are in the West generally. As a matter of fact, I think we have suffered less than any of our neighbor States. One reason for it, I think, is that we have been unusually active in calling to the attention of the department the needs of our people for

postal service. The department by the discontinuance of these 11 routes—and nothing has been furnished to take the place of most of them, no other postal facilities having been provided—has saved something like \$11,000, and by reducing the frequency of service on various other routes it has accomplished a saving of about \$3,000, or a total saving in our State in these routes of something less than \$15,000. I assume that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads takes this position, that every American community, every locality, where any considerable number of American people live is entitled to some postal facilities, and, be the cost however so high, some sort of postal facilities should be afforded.

The Fourth Assistant Postmaster General does not provide for the postal routes in Alaska. That service comes under the Second Assistant. I think if the Fourth Assistant had experience with the Alaskan business he would be a little more inclined to be liberal with western communities at home. In Alaska we spend \$10 per capita for the carrying of the mail by star routes to the 35,000 white people who occupy that Territory. In a large portion of the West the expenditure is not one-fifth that amount. On the rural routes the cost of delivery, if I recollect rightly, is about \$2.50 per annum per capita. Beginning with a cost of about 50 cents per capita, it has gone to \$2.50 per capita, if I am rightly informed. The Postmaster General desires to make a saving by letting these routes by contract, and he believes that he can accomplish a saving of eighteen to twenty million dollars in so doing. I think that is questionable. I do not believe it would be possible to accomplish so great a saving as that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. COX. Does the star-route service in the gentleman's part of the country perform the same service that the rural delivery does?

Mr. MONDELL. Not entirely, because the star-route carriers do not sell stamps.

Mr. COX. Or money orders?

Mr. MONDELL. They do not do money-order business; but, with that exception, they do practically everything that the rural carrier does. They deliver the mail in boxes and collect mail along the routes and deliver the pouches at the post offices on and at the end of the route.

Mr. COX. Ordinarily, what is the length of your star-route service as compared to the rural routes?

Mr. MONDELL. The star-route service is all the way from 5 to 150 miles. They vary quite a good deal.

Mr. COX. What is the comparative cost between the two? Which is the higher, the star-route or the rural-route service?

Mr. MONDELL. According to the statement made before the committee by the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, the average cost of star routes the country over is a trifle less than 10 cents, and the cost of rural delivery the country over is about the same fraction less than 16 cents, or a difference of almost 5 cents a mile.

Mr. COX. What is the cost per mile traveled for star-route service in the gentleman's country?

Mr. MONDELL. The cost of star-route service in the mountain region is almost exactly the same as the cost of rural delivery the country over.

Mr. COX. That is what I thought.

Mr. MONDELL. Almost exactly the same. Before I come to that, Mr. Chairman, I desire to emphasize what I had started out to say. I think the Postmaster General is mistaken in his estimate of the saving that he would make by a change of policy, because I believe that with the extension and the enlargement and the growth of the parcel post, the lowest contract rates that could be secured on the routes would be larger than the Postmaster General has estimated. But here is the situation out in our country, where we have to contract for the carrying of the mail: If the cost in any case approaches the average cost of the rural route per mile, the postal authorities say that the bid is too high. They again advertise, and sometimes four and five different successive bids are submitted before the department will let a contract, and frequently they refuse to let a contract at all. We are securing practically no new routes. We have applications pending in my State for some needed and necessary new star routes, and it is the most difficult thing in the world to get the department to give those routes favorable consideration. We should have reestablished most of the 11 routes that have been discontinued. Owing to the increased cost, by reason of the parcel post, the department refuses to let contracts. In other words, their attitude is this: The parcel post, instituted for the benefit of the people, in view of the fact that it increases the cost of the service, is to be denied to the people in these rural communities, and all other service with it.

Mr. STEENERSON. I want to inquire of the gentleman if he knew whether the refusal to extend these rural routes was begun lately or since the European war, or whether the practice is the same now as it was before?

Mr. MONDELL. I hope the department is not now refusing to establish these routes on account of the war in Europe. They are declining to establish them, evidently, on account of their desire to economize. Now, I do not wish to be unfairly critical of the department. The gentlemen down there have treated me with every consideration up to the point of letting contracts, and they have awarded some contracts with regard to which it seemed pretty difficult to persuade their judgment. The difficulty is that in the department there has grown up a notion that the Postal Service must pay everywhere, and that is the theory that is wrecking our star-route service. If we can afford to pay \$10 to carry mail to every man, woman, and child in Alaska, we can afford to pay whatever sum is necessary—and it will be much less than that—to carry mail, at least occasionally and with reasonable frequency, to the people in the isolated settlements of the mountain States. There are people in my State 25, 30, and 40 miles from a post office who are now receiving no mail at all. These are not heavily settled districts, but there are considerable numbers of people so deprived, and largely due to this mistaken notion—which is not shared, I am sure, by the Post Office Committee or any of its members—that the Postal Service must be made to pay. We established the Postal Service for the purpose of supplying the people of the United States, wherever they might settle, with mail at reasonable intervals, and I hope and pray that the department will overcome and get away from its present disposition to unreasonably economize at our expense. I hope they will reestablish these old routes and give fair consideration to the demands we are making for new ones. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill, H. R. 19906, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MURDOCK, for 10 days, on account of sickness.

To Mr. Davenport, indefinitely, on account of illness.

LEGISLATION ON POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman from Texas think the House ought to be notified that we are about to take this rule up?

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I think possibly we can get them here after we begin the discussion. There will be some discussion on the rule, but I have no objection—

Mr. MANN. How much time is expected to be given?

Mr. HENRY. How much time would the gentleman like to have on that side?

Mr. LENROOT. Say 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. HENRY. If we should agree to 20 minutes on a side, I shall move the previous question at the end of the 40 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the gentleman think that Members—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have the Members here, and therefore I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. HENRY. I thought we might read the resolution first.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point of order there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Alken	Anthony	Barton	Brodbeck
Alney	Ashbrook	Beall, Tex.	Broussard
Alexander	Avis	Bell, Ga.	Brown, N. Y.
Anderson	Baltz	Blackmon	Brown, W. Va.
Ansberry	Barchfeld	Britten	Browning

Bruckner	Gardner	Langham	Price
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tenn.	Lee, Ga.	Prouty
Burnett	George	Lee, Pa.	Reed
Butler	Gerry	L'Engle	Riordan
Caldier	Gittins	Leshner	Roberts, Mass.
Campbell	Glass	Lever	Rothermel
Cantor	Godwin, N. C.	Levy	Rucker
Carew	Goldfogle	Lewis, Md.	Scully
Carlin	Gordon	Lewis, Pa.	Seldomridge
Casey	Gorman	Lindquist	Sells
Clancy	Graham, Ill.	Linthicum	Sherwood
Clark, Fla.	Graham, Pa.	Lloyd	Shreve
Claypool	Green, Iowa	Loft	Sims
Connolly, Kans.	Gregg	Logue	Sinnott
Copley	Griest	McAndrews	Slemp
Cramton	Griffin	McClellan	Smith, Md.
Dale	Hamill	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Davenport	Hamilton, Mich.	McKenzie	Stedman
Deltrick	Hamilton, N. Y.	McLaughlin	Taggart
Difenderfer	Hart	Maher	Talbot, Md.
Donohoe	Haugen	Martin	Talcott, N. Y.
Dooling	Hawley	Metz	Taylor, Ala.
Doremus	Helgesen	Miller	Taylor, N. Y.
Driscoll	Hobson	Moore	Thacher
Drukker	Howard	Morin	Towner
Dunn	Howell	Moss, Ind.	Townsend
Eagan	Hughes, W. Va.	Moss, W. Va.	Underhill
Eagle	Hullings	Murdock	Vare
Edmonds	Humphreys, Miss.	Neeley, Kans.	Vollmer
Edwards	Johnson, Utah	Neely, W. Va.	Walker
Elder	Johnson, Wash.	Nolan, J. I.	Walsh
Esch	Jones	O'Brien	Watkins
Estopinal	Kennedy, Conn.	O'Hair	Whitacre
Fairchild	Kindel	O'Leary	Wilson, Fla.
Faison	Kinhead, N. J.	Patten, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Flood, Va.	Knowland, J. R.	Peters	Winslow
Floyd, Ark.	Konop	Peterson	
French	Korby	Platt	
Gallivan	Kreider	Post	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 256 Members, a quorum, have answered to their names.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas offers a privileged resolution from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 684 (H. Rept. 1240).

Resolved, That after the adoption of this rule it shall be in order in the consideration of H. R. 19906, a bill making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, and for other purposes, to consider new legislation in said bill, notwithstanding the rules of the House, as follows, to wit:

"For compensation to clerks and employees at first and second class post offices:

"Superintendents of finance, superintendents of mails, and superintendents of delivery, six at not exceeding \$3,800 each;

"Superintendents of finance, and superintendents of mails, six at not exceeding \$3,400 each;

"Superintendents of finance, and superintendents of mails, 16 at not exceeding \$3,200 each;

"Superintendents of finance, auditors, and superintendents of mails, 20 at not exceeding \$3,000 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, 30 at not exceeding \$2,800 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of stations, 55 at not exceeding \$2,600 each;

"Superintendents of stations, 10 at not exceeding \$2,500 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of delivery, and superintendents of stations, 60 at not exceeding \$2,400 each;

"Superintendents of stations, 15 at not exceeding \$2,300 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, and superintendents of stations, 60 at not exceeding \$2,200 each;

"Superintendents of stations, 40 at not exceeding \$2,100 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 140 at not exceeding \$2,000 each;

"Superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 70 at not exceeding \$1,900 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 150 at not exceeding \$1,800 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 240 at not exceeding \$1,700 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 400 at not exceeding \$1,600 each;

"Superintendents of finance, cashiers, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, assistant superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 700 at not exceeding \$1,500 each;

"Superintendents of finance, bookkeepers, superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 1,575, at not exceeding \$1,400 each;

"Superintendents of finance, superintendents of mails, superintendents of stations, foremen, special clerks, and stenographers, 2,700, at not exceeding \$1,300 each;

"Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 18,500, at not exceeding \$1,200 each;

"Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 8,800, at not exceeding \$1,100 each;

"Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 6,535, at not exceeding \$1,000 each;

"Stenographers, clerks in charge, and clerks, 2,650, at not exceeding \$900 each;

"Clerks in charge and clerks, 2,339, at not exceeding \$800 each;

"Substitutes for clerks and employees absent without pay;

"And to provide for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and for the promotion of 75 per cent of the clerks in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade; in all, \$48,860,000; and hereafter the appointment and assignment of clerks hereunder shall be so made during each fiscal year as not to involve a greater aggregate expenditure than the sum appropriated: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation to employees other than those in the clerical grades in post offices of the first class shall be annual salaries graded in even hundreds of dollars based upon the postal receipts for the preceding calendar year of the post office at which they are employed, as follows:

"At each post office where the receipts are \$40,000 but less than \$60,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,300; superintendent of mails, \$1,300.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$60,000 but less than \$100,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,400; superintendent of mails, \$1,400.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$100,000 but less than \$150,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,500; superintendent of mails, \$1,500.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$150,000 but less than \$200,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,600; superintendent of mails, \$1,600.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$200,000 but less than \$300,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,700; superintendent of mails, \$1,700.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$300,000 but less than \$400,000: Superintendent of finance, \$1,800; cashiers, \$1,500; superintendent of mails, \$1,800; assistant superintendent of mails, \$1,500.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$400,000 but less than \$600,000: Superintendent of finance, \$2,000; cashiers, \$1,600; superintendent of mails, \$2,000; assistant superintendent of mails, \$1,600; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$600,000 but less than \$800,000: Superintendent of finance, \$2,200; cashiers, \$1,700; superintendent of mails, \$2,200; assistant superintendents of mails, \$1,600 and \$1,700; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$800,000 but less than \$1,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$2,400; cashiers, \$1,800; superintendent of mails, \$2,400; assistant superintendents of mails, \$1,700 and \$1,800; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$1,400.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$1,000,000 but less than \$1,500,000: Superintendent of finance, \$2,600; cashiers, \$2,000; superintendent of mails, \$2,600; assistant superintendents of mails, \$1,800 and \$2,000; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$1,500.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$1,500,000 but less than \$2,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$2,800; cashiers, \$2,200; superintendent of mails, \$2,800; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,000 and \$2,200; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$1,600.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$2,000,000 but less than \$3,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$3,000; cashiers, \$2,400; superintendent of mails, \$3,000; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,000, \$2,200, and \$2,400; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$1,800.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$3,000,000 but less than \$5,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$3,200; cashiers, \$2,600; superintendent of mails, \$3,200; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,200, \$2,400, and \$2,600; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$2,000.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$5,000,000 but less than \$10,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$3,400; cashiers, \$2,800; superintendent of mails, \$3,400; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,400, \$2,600, and \$2,800; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$2,200.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$10,000,000 but less than \$20,000,000: Superintendent of finance, \$3,600; cashiers, \$2,800; superintendent of mails, \$3,400; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,400, \$2,600, and \$2,800; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$2,400.

"At each post office where the receipts are \$20,000,000 or over: Superintendent of finance, \$3,800; cashiers, \$2,800; superintendent of mails, \$3,800; assistant superintendents of mails, \$2,400, \$2,600, and \$2,800; superintendent of delivery, \$3,800; assistant superintendents of delivery, \$2,400, \$2,600, and \$2,800; stenographers, \$900 to \$1,200; bookkeeper, \$2,400; auditor, \$3,000: *And provided further*, That there may also be employed at first-class post offices special clerks, foremen, and stenographers at a salary of \$1,300 or more per annum, the total number at any post office not to exceed one at \$1,300 for each \$100,000 receipts, one at \$1,400 for each \$200,000 receipts, one at \$1,500 for each \$400,000 receipts, one at \$1,600 for each \$800,000 receipts, one at \$1,700 for each \$1,500,000 receipts, one at \$1,800 for each \$3,000,000 receipts, one at \$1,900 for each \$6,000,000 receipts, and one at \$2,000 for each \$12,000,000 receipts: *And provided further*, That on and after July 1, 1915, the salary of station superintendents shall be based on the postal receipts and number of employees at their respective stations on the following basis:

"When the receipts of a carrier station do not exceed \$5,000 per annum, the station shall have a credit of 3 points, and for each additional \$5,000 a credit of 1 point.

"When the receipts of a noncarrier station do not exceed \$5,000 per annum, the station shall have a credit of 3 points, and for each additional \$30,000 a credit of 1 point.

"When the employees (clerks and carriers, city and rural) at a carrier station are 3 or less, the station shall have a credit of 1 point and for each multiple of 3 employees a credit of 1 point.

"Stations having credit of less than 5 points shall be in charge of a clerk at a salary not to exceed \$1,200.

"At stations having a total credit of 5 points or more the salary of the superintendent shall be as follows: Five and 6 points, superintendent, \$1,300; 7 to 9 points, superintendent, \$1,400; 10 to 13 points, superintendent, \$1,500; 14 to 18 points, superintendent, \$1,600; 19 to 23 points, superintendent, \$1,700; 24 to 32 points, superintendent, \$1,800; 33 to 44 points, superintendent, \$1,900; 45 to 64 points, superintendent, \$2,000; 65 to 100 points, superintendent, \$2,100;

101 to 135 points, superintendent, \$2,200; 136 to 200 points, superintendent, \$2,300; 201 to 275 points, superintendent, \$2,400; 276 to 350 points, superintendent, \$2,500; 351 points and over, superintendent, \$2,600."

Second, Line 26, page 15, and lines 1 and 2, page 16, as follows:
Provided, That hereafter the Postmaster General may enter into contracts for the conduct of such stations for a term not exceeding two years."

Third, Page 23, lines 21 to 25, inclusive; and page 24, lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, as follows:

"The appropriation for two delegates to the International Postal Union, at Madrid, to be appointed by the Postmaster General from the Post Office Department, made by the act of August 24, 1912, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes, is hereby continued and shall be available for such convention when it shall be held."

Fourth, Page 25, lines 8 to 19, inclusive, as follows:

"For pay of letter carriers, substitutes for carriers on annual leave, clerks in charge of substations, and tolls and ferrage, Rural Delivery Service, \$54,700,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$20,000 of the amount hereby appropriated may be used for compensation of clerks in charge of substations: *Provided further*, That for experimental purposes, under such regulations as he may prescribe, the Postmaster General is authorized to advertise for proposals and to enter into contracts with the lowest responsible bidders for a period of not exceeding four years, for performing service on rural routes in one county in each State, and to pay for the same out of the amount hereby appropriated"—and any and all other new legislation in section 1.

Fifth, Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26, beginning with line 20, page 30, of said bill, and ending with line 3, page 54, as follows:

"Sec. 2. That the act approved August 24, 1912, being 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes,' is hereby amended as follows: At the end of section 5 of said act, after the word 'service,' insert the following: '*Provided*, That compensatory time for Sunday service during the month of December in any year may be allowed during the month of January next succeeding.'"

"Sec. 3. That hereafter the Postmaster General may establish, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, one or more branch offices, nonaccounting offices, or stations of any post office for the transaction of such postal business as may be required for the convenience of the public."

"Sec. 4. That hereafter the Postmaster General may enter into contracts for the conduct of such stations for a term not exceeding four years."

"Sec. 5. That on and after July 1, 1915, when the total compensation of any postmaster at a post office of the fourth class for four consecutive quarters shall amount to \$1,000, exclusive of commissions on money orders issued, and the receipts of such post office for the same period shall aggregate as much as \$1,000, the Auditor for the Post Office Department shall so report to the Postmaster General, who shall, in pursuance of such report, assign such post office to its proper class, to become effective at the beginning of the next succeeding quarterly period, and fix the salary of the postmaster accordingly."

"Sec. 6. That so much of section 1 of the 'act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1912, which provides that the Post Office Department shall not extend or enlarge its present policy of sending second-class matter by freight trains, is hereby repealed."

"Sec. 7. That the Postmaster General, in cases of emergency, between October 1 and April 1 of any year, may hereafter return to the mails empty mail bags theretofore withdrawn therefrom as required by law, and for such times may pay for their railroad transportation out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes at not exceeding the rate per pound per mile as shown by the last adjustment for mail service on the route over which they may be carried, and pay for necessary cartage out of the appropriation for freight or expressage."

"Sec. 8. That when, during a weighing period, on account of floods or other causes, interruptions in service occur on railroad routes and weights of mail are decreased below the normal, or where there is an omission to take weights, the Postmaster General, for the purpose of readjusting compensation on such railroad routes as are affected thereby, is hereafter authorized, in his discretion, to add to the weights of mails ascertained on such routes during that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been normal the estimated weights for that part of the weighing period when conditions are shown to have been not normal or where there has been an omission to take weights, based upon the average of weights taken during that part of the weighing period during which conditions are shown to have been normal, the actual weights and the estimated weights to form the basis for the average weight per day upon which to readjust the compensation according to law on such railroad routes for the transportation of the mails, notwithstanding the provision of the act of Congress approved March 3, 1905, requiring that the average weight shall be ascertained by the actual weighing of the mails for such a number of successive working days, not less than 90, as the Postmaster General may direct: *Provided further*, That readjustments from July 1, 1913, may be made under this provision on routes in the first section affected by the floods in the Ohio Valley and tributary territories, commencing about March 25, 1913."

"Sec. 9. That so much of section 4 of 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1912, as provides that no adjustment shall be made unless the diverted mails equal at least 10 per cent of the average daily weight on any of the routes affected is hereby repealed."

"Sec. 10. That hereafter the Postmaster General may transfer, under such regulations as he may prescribe, clerks from post offices of the first and second classes to the Railway Mail Service at salaries not exceeding the salary which the clerks are receiving in the post offices at the time of such transfer, with the consent of the clerk."

"Sec. 11. That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to readjust the compensation to be paid to railroad companies from the 30th day of June, 1915, or as soon thereafter as may be practicable, for the transportation and handling of the mails and furnishing facilities and services in connection therewith upon the conditions and at the rates hereinafter provided."

"The Postmaster General may state railroad mail routes and authorize mail service thereon of the following four classes, namely: Full railway post-office car service, apartment railway post-office car service, storage-car service, and closed-pouch service."

"Full railway post-office car mail service shall be service by cars 40 feet or more in length, constructed, fitted up, and maintained for the distribution of mails on trains. The authorization of full railway post-office cars shall be for standard-size cars 60 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided."

"Apartment railway post-office car mail service shall be service by apartments less than 40 feet in length in cars constructed, fitted up, and maintained for the distribution of mails on trains. Two standard sizes of apartment railway post-office cars may be authorized and paid for, namely, apartments 15 feet and 30 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided."

"Storage-car mail service shall be service by cars used for the storage and carriage of mails in transit other than by full and apartment railway post-office cars. The authorizations for storage cars shall be for cars 60 feet in length, inside measurement, except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That less than 60 feet of storage space may be authorized in baggage cars."

"Service by full and apartment railway post-office cars and storage cars shall include the carriage therein of all mail matter, equipment, and supplies for the mail service and the employees of the Postal Service or Post Office Department as shall be directed by the Postmaster General to be so carried."

"Closed-pouch mail service shall be the transportation and handling by railroad employees of mails on trains on which full or apartment railway post-office cars are not authorized, except as hereinafter provided."

"The rates of payment for the services authorized in accordance with this act shall be as follows, namely:

"For full railway post-office car mail service at not exceeding 21 cents for each mile of service by a 60-foot car."

"In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding \$2 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 60-foot car."

"For apartment railway post-office car mail service at not exceeding 10½ cents for each mile of service by a 30-foot apartment car and 5½ cents for each mile of service by a 15-foot apartment car."

"In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding \$1 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 30-foot apartment car and 50 cents as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 15-foot apartment car."

"For storage-car mail service at not exceeding 20 cents for each mile of service by a 60-foot car."

"In addition thereto he may allow not exceeding \$2 as an initial rate and the same as a terminal rate for each one-way trip of a 60-foot car."

"Where authorizations are made for cars of the standard lengths of 60, 30, and 15 feet, as provided by this act, and the railroad company is unable to furnish such cars of the length authorized, but furnishes cars of lesser length than those authorized, but which are determined by the department to be sufficient for the service, the Postmaster General may accept the same and pay only for the actual space furnished and used, the compensation to be not exceeding pro rata of that provided by this act for the standard length so authorized: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may accept cars and apartments of greater length than those of the standard requested, but no compensation shall be allowed for such excess lengths."

"For closed-pouch service, on routes upon which closed-pouch service only is performed, at not exceeding the rates of compensation provided by existing law for average daily weights of mail carried over the whole route; on routes upon which apartment railway post-office car and closed-pouch services are performed, at not exceeding \$20 per mile per annum for each 2,000 pounds average daily weight of mails carried, and at pro rata of such rate of compensation for each 100 pounds of average daily weight greater or less than 2,000 pounds; and on routes upon which full railway post-office car and closed-pouch services or full railway post-office car, apartment-car, and closed-pouch services are performed, at not exceeding \$19 per mile per annum for each 2,000 pounds average daily weight of mails carried, and at pro rata of such rate of compensation for each 100 pounds of average daily weight greater or less than 2,000 pounds, the average daily weights to be ascertained in every case by the actual weighing of the mails."

"The Postmaster General may require railroad companies carrying the mails to deliver them into and take them from the terminal and intermediate post offices and transfer them between railroad stations on their routes without additional compensation, under such regulations as he may deem proper, in cases where he does not provide for such service otherwise: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General, in his discretion, may relieve any of the roads of such service."

"Railroad companies whose railroads were constructed in whole or in part by a land grant made by Congress, on the conditions that the mails should be transported over their roads at such price as Congress should by law direct, shall receive only 80 per cent of the compensation otherwise authorized by this act."

"The initial and terminal rates provided for herein shall cover expenses of loading and unloading mails, switching, lighting, heating, cleaning mail cars, and all other expenses incidental to station service and required by the Postmaster General in connection with the mails that are not included in the car-mile rate. The allowance for full railway post-office cars, apartment railway post-office cars, and storage cars may be varied in accordance with the approximate difference in their respective cost of construction and maintenance."

"For the purpose of ascertaining the average weight of closed-pouch mails per day upon which to adjust compensation, the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to have such mails carried on the several routes weighed by the employees of the Post Office Department for such a number of successive days, not less than 35, at such times after July 1, 1915, as he may direct, and not less frequently than once in every year thereafter, the result to be stated and certified in such form and manner as he may direct. In computing the average weight of mails per day carried on a railroad route, the whole number of days included in the weighing period shall be used as a divisor. The expense of taking the weights of mails and the compensation to tabulators and clerks employed in connection with the weighings, for assistance in completing computations, and of rentals, if necessary, in Washington, D. C., shall be paid out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes."

"In computing the car-miles of the full railway post-office cars and apartment railway post-office cars, the maximum space authorized in either direction of a round-trip car run shall be regarded as the space to be computed in both directions, unless otherwise mutually agreed upon."

"In computing the car-miles of storage cars, the maximum space authorized in either direction of a round-trip car run shall be regarded as the space to be computed in both directions, unless the car be used

by the company in the return movement, or otherwise mutually agreed upon.

"New service and additional service may be authorized at not exceeding the rates herein provided, and service may be reduced or discontinued with pro rata reductions in pay, as the needs of the Postal Service may require: *Provided*, That no additional pay shall be allowed for additional closed-pouch service on established routes until the next regular readjustment of pay therefor on such routes, and no additional pay shall be allowed for additional car service unless specifically authorized by the Postmaster General.

"All cars or parts of cars used for the Railway Mail Service shall be of such construction, style, length, and character, and furnished in such manner as shall be required by the Postmaster General, and shall be constructed, fitted up, maintained, heated, lighted, and cleaned by and at the expense of the railroad companies. No pay shall be allowed for service by any railway post-office car which is not sound in material and construction and which is not equipped with sanitary drinking-water containers and toilet facilities, nor unless such car is regularly and thoroughly cleaned. No pay shall be allowed for service by any wooden full railway post-office car unless constructed substantially in accordance with the most approved plans and specifications of the Post Office Department for such type of cars, nor for service by any wooden full railway post-office car run in any train between adjoining steel cars, or between the engine and a steel car adjoining. After the 1st of July, 1917, the Postmaster General shall not approve, or allow to be used, or pay for service by, any full railway post-office car not constructed of steel or steel underframe or equally indestructible material, and not less than 25 per cent of the full railway post-office cars of a railway company not conforming to these provisions on August 24, 1912, shall be replaced with cars constructed of steel annually after June, 1913; and all full railway post-office cars accepted for this service and contracted for by the railroad companies hereafter shall be constructed of steel. Until July 1, 1917, in cases of emergency and in cases where the necessities of the service require it, the Postmaster General may provide for service by full railway post-office cars of other than steel or steel underframe construction, and fix therefor such rate of compensation within the maximum herein provided as shall give consideration to the inferior character of construction and the railroad companies shall furnish service by such cars at such rates so fixed.

"Service over property owned or controlled by another company or a terminal company shall be considered service of the railroad company using such property and not that of the other or terminal company: *Provided*, That service over a land-grant road shall be paid for as herein provided.

"Railroad companies carrying the mails shall furnish all necessary facilities for caring for and handling them while in their custody. They shall furnish all cars or parts of cars used in the transportation and distribution of the mails, except as is herein otherwise provided, and place them in stations before the departure of trains at such times and when required to do so. They shall provide station space and rooms for handling, distribution, and transfer of mails in transit, and for offices and rooms for the employees of the Postal Service engaged in such transportation, when required by the Postmaster General.

"Every railroad company carrying the mails shall carry on any train it operates and without extra charge therefor the persons in charge of the mails, and when on duty and traveling to and from duty, and all duly accredited agents and officers of the Post Office Department and the Postal Service, while traveling on official business, upon the exhibition of their credentials.

"If any railroad company carrying the mails shall fail or refuse to provide cars or apartments in cars for distribution purposes when required by the Postmaster General, or shall fail or refuse to construct, fit up, maintain, heat, light, and clean such cars and provide such appliances for use in case of accident as may be required by the Postmaster General, it shall be fined such reasonable sum as may, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be deemed proper.

"The Postmaster General shall in all cases decide upon what trains and in what manner the mails shall be conveyed. Every railroad company carrying the mails shall carry on any train it operates and with due speed all mailable matter, equipment, and supplies directed to be carried thereon. If any such railroad company shall fail or refuse to transport the mails, equipment, and supplies when required by the Postmaster General on any train or trains it operates, such company shall be fined such reasonable amount as may, in the discretion of the Postmaster General, be deemed proper.

"The Postmaster General may make deductions from the pay of railroad companies carrying the mails under the provisions of this act for reduction in service or in frequency of service where, in his judgment, the importance of the facilities withdrawn or reduced requires it, and impose fines upon them for delinquencies. He may deduct the price of the value of the service in cases where it is not performed, and not exceeding three times its value if the failure be occasioned by the fault of the railroad company.

"The provisions of this act shall apply to service operated by railroad companies partly by railroad and partly by steamboat.

"The provisions of this act respecting the rates of compensation shall not apply to mails conveyed under special arrangement in freight trains, for which rates not exceeding the usual and just freight rates may be paid, in accordance with the classifications and tariffs approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"Railroad companies carrying the mails shall submit, under oath, when and in such form as may be required by the Postmaster General, evidence as to the performance of service.

"The Postmaster General is authorized to employ such clerical and other assistance as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and to rent quarters in Washington, D. C., if necessary, for the clerical force engaged thereon, and to pay for the same out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

"The Postmaster General shall from time to time request information from the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the revenue received by railroad companies from express companies for services rendered in the transportation of express matter, and may, in his discretion, arrange for the transportation of mail matter other than of the first class at rates not exceeding those so ascertained and reported to him, and it shall be the duty of the railroad companies to carry such mail matter at such rates fixed by the Postmaster General.

"The Postmaster General is authorized, in his discretion, to petition the Interstate Commerce Commission for the determination of a postal-carload or less-than-carload rate for transportation of mail matter of the fourth class and periodicals, and may provide for and authorize such transportation, when practicable, at such rates, and it shall be the duty of the railroad companies to provide and perform such service at such rates and on the conditions prescribed by the Postmaster General.

"The Postmaster General may, in his discretion, distinguish between the several classes of mail matter and provide for less frequent dispatches of mail matter of the third and fourth classes and periodicals, when lower rates for transportation or other economies may be secured thereby without material detriment to the service.

"The Postmaster General is authorized to return to the mails, when practicable for the utilization of car space paid for and not needed for the mails, postal cards, stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, empty mail bags, furniture, equipment, and other supplies for the Postal Service.

"The Postmaster General, in cases of emergency between October 1 and April 1 of any year, may hereafter return to the mails empty mail bags and other equipment theretofore withdrawn therefrom as required by law, and where such return requires additional authorization of car space under the provisions of this act to pay for the transportation thereof as provided for herein out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

"The Postmaster General may have the weights of mail taken on railroad mail routes and computations of the average loads of the several classes of cars and other computations for statistical and administrative purposes made at such times as he may elect, and pay the expense thereof out of the appropriation for inland transportation by railroad routes.

"It shall be unlawful for any railroad company to refuse to perform mail service at the rates of compensation provided by law, when and for the period required by the Postmaster General so to do, and for every such offense it shall be fined not exceeding \$5,000.

"That the unexpended balances of the appropriations for inland transportation by railroad routes and for railway post-office car service, by the act of March 9, 1914, making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, and for other purposes, are hereby made available for the purposes of this act.

"Sec. 12. That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's order No. 7720, of December 18, 1913, respecting rates upon and limit of weight of parcel-post packages in the local, first, and second zones, and effective from August 15, 1913, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after August 15, 1913, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding one-half of 1 per cent thereof per annum.

"Sec. 13. That on account of the increased weight of mails resulting from Postmaster General's order No. 7720, of December 18, 1913, respecting rates upon and limit of weight of parcel-post packages effective from January 1, 1914, the Postmaster General is authorized to add to the compensation paid for transportation on railroad routes on and after January 1, 1914, for the remainder of the contract terms, not exceeding 1 per cent thereof per annum.

"Sec. 14. That the appropriation for the manufacture of postage stamps be so amended that advance payment can be made to the director of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of postage stamps.

"Sec. 15. That under such regulations as the Postmaster General may establish for the collection of the lawful revenue and for facilitating the handling of such matter in the mails it shall be lawful to accept for transmission in the mails quantities of not less than 500 identical pieces of third-class matter and of second-class matter mailed at the special rates of 1 cent and 2 cents a copy and of 250 identical pieces of fourth-class matter without postage stamps affixed: *Provided*, That postage shall be fully prepaid thereon at the rate required by law for a single piece of such matter.

"Sec. 16. That such part of section 6 of the act approved June 25, 1910, authorizing a system of postal savings depositories as reads, 'but no one shall be permitted to deposit more than \$100 in any one calendar month' is hereby amended to read as follows: 'but the balance to the credit of any person, upon which interest is payable, shall not exceed \$1,000, exclusive of accumulated interest'; and said act is further amended so as to repeal the proviso in section 7 thereof and insert in lieu of such proviso the following: '*Provided*, That the board of trustees may, in their discretion, and under such regulations as such board may promulgate, accept additional deposits not to exceed in the aggregate \$1,000 for each depositor, but upon which no interest shall be paid.'

"Sec. 17. That if any person shall hereafter perform any service for any contractor or subcontractor in carrying the mail, he shall, upon filing in the department his contract for such service and satisfactory evidence of its performance, thereafter have a lien on any money due such contractor or subcontractor for such service to the amount of same; and if such contractor or subcontractor shall fail to pay the party or parties who have performed service as aforesaid the amount due for such service within two months after the expiration of the month in which such service shall have been performed the Postmaster General may cause the amount due to be paid said party or parties and charged to the contractor: *Provided*, That such payment shall not in any case exceed the rate of pay per annum of the contractor or subcontractor.

"Sec. 18. That whenever an accepted bidder shall fail to enter into contract, or a contractor on any mail route shall fail or refuse to perform the service on said route according to his contract, or when a new route shall be established or new service required, or when, from any other cause, there shall not be a contractor legally bound or required to perform such service, the Postmaster General may make a temporary contract for carrying the mail on such route, without advertisement, for such period as may be necessary, not in any case exceeding one year, until the service shall have commenced under a contract made according to law: *Provided*, That the cost of temporary service rendered necessary by reason of the failure of any accepted bidder to enter into contract or a contractor to perform service shall be charged to such bidder or contractor.

"All acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 19. That section 3949 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All contracts for carrying the mail should be in the name of the United States, and shall be awarded to the lowest bidder tendering sufficient guaranties for faithful performance in accordance with the terms of the advertisement: *Provided, however*, That such contracts require due celerity, certainty, and security in the performance of the service; but the Postmaster General shall not be bound to consider the bid of any person who has willfully or negligently failed to perform a former contract.

"Sec. 20. That the act of March 4, 1909 (ch. 321, sec. 198, 35 Stat., p. 1126), be amended to read as follows:

"Whoever shall willfully or maliciously injure, tear down, or destroy any letter box or other receptacle intended or used for the receipt

or delivery of mail on any mail route, or shall break open the same, or shall willfully or maliciously injure, deface, or destroy any mail deposited therein, or shall willfully take or steal such mail from or out of such letter box or other receptacle, or shall willfully aid or assist in any of the aforementioned offenses, shall for every such offense be punished by a fine of not more than \$1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years.

"Sec. 21. That section 3938 of the Revised Statutes be amended to read as follows:

"All letters of domestic origin which can not be delivered by postmasters shall be sent to the Post Office Department, and such as contain inclosures of value, other than correspondence, shall be recorded. If the sender or addressee can not be identified, such letters shall be held for a period of one year awaiting reclamation. If within one year they have not been claimed, they shall be disposed of as the Postmaster General may direct.

"All other undeliverable letters shall be disposed of without record and not held for reclamation."

"Sec. 22. That whenever in the judgment of the Postmaster General the bids received for any star route are exorbitant or unreasonable, or whenever he has reason to believe that a combination of bidders has been entered into to fix the rate for star-route service, the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, authorized out of the appropriation for inland transportation by star routes, to employ and use such means or methods to provide the desired service as he may deem expedient, without reference to existing law or laws respecting the employment of personal service or the procurement of conveyances, materials, or supplies.

"Sec. 23. That on and after July 1, 1915, the compensation of each rural letter carrier for serving a standard route of 24 miles and over six days in the week shall be \$1,200 per annum, payable monthly; on routes 22 miles and less than 24 miles, \$1,152; on routes 20 miles and less than 22 miles, \$1,080; on routes 18 miles and less than 20 miles, \$960; on routes 16 miles and less than 18 miles, \$840; on routes 14 miles and less than 16 miles, \$720; on routes 12 miles and less than 14 miles, \$672; on routes 10 miles and less than 12 miles, \$624; on routes 8 miles and less than 10 miles, \$576; on routes 6 miles and less than 8 miles, \$528; on routes 4 miles and less than 6 miles, \$480. A rural letter carrier serving one triweekly route shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half the length of the route served by him, and a carrier serving two triweekly routes shall be paid on the basis for a route one-half of the combined length of the two routes: *Provided*, That in the discretion of the Postmaster General the pay of carriers who furnish and maintain their own motor vehicles and who serve routes not less than 50 miles in length may be fixed at not exceeding \$1,800 per annum.

"Sec. 24. That the act approved January 21, 1914 (Public, 49), authorizing the Postmaster General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for loss by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty be so amended as to include Navy mail clerks and assistant Navy mail clerks."

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentlemen on the other side that if this rule is sufficiently understood I will be glad to submit it to a vote of the House without any discussion.

Mr. LENROOT. We want some discussion.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY. I yield.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman permit me to offer an amendment to this rule?

Mr. HENRY. I would not feel at liberty to do that, I regret to say.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to move the previous question until the rule is understood, but still, if it is agreeable to the House, I will move the previous question now, and then we will have 20 minutes of debate on a side.

Mr. BARNHART. What objection would the gentleman have, inasmuch as it is growing late, to letting the matter go over until Monday, so that we may have time to read and consider this rule?

Mr. HENRY. Personally, I have no objection. The only thing is this, that Monday is unanimous-consent day, and I suppose that nothing could supersede the proceedings of that day. Then on Tuesday we hope to bring up and expect to present to the House a special rule to consider the Hobson national prohibition amendment.

Mr. BARNHART. Then, nothing can be done on this bill until after the holidays?

Mr. HENRY. No; but this is what I was going to say, if the gentleman will allow me to complete my thought: It occurs to me that, inasmuch as there was some misunderstanding and confusion as to this rule yesterday, the Members on this side would be glad to verify their vote here to-day and vote in accordance with the matters as they understand them, and not allow their votes to go to the country for a week or two weeks and have them misunderstood before this rule is presented.

Mr. Speaker, I will state to the House that I shall explain the rule after I have moved the previous question, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope the gentleman will have his debate first and then move the previous question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman has control of the floor—

Mr. HENRY. I do not think the Speaker would construe what I have said as being debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would not construe it as debate.

Mr. HENRY. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course, if the gentleman moves the previous question, there will be no opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. HENRY. No; there would not be opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If I had a chance to offer the amendment, I would vote for the previous question. If I can not offer the amendment, I will vote against the previous question.

Mr. HENRY. I would be glad to have the gentleman offer the amendment after the previous question is ordered and let the Speaker act on it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can not even offer it for the Speaker to act on it if the previous question is ordered.

Mr. LENROOT. Can not we agree on time for debate, after which the previous question will be moved?

Mr. HENRY. I will move the previous question at the end of the 40 minutes; and yet I would move the previous question now if it is satisfactory to the House, and we can have as much of that 40 minutes for debate as we wish.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I will be glad to.

Mr. CALLAWAY. We had speeches yesterday on the rule. Nobody seems to understand it from the speeches that were made. The assumption now is that Members voted upon the rule yesterday without understanding. Now there comes in here a different rule. It was read at the desk, and nobody heard it. It has not been printed at all. We have not had any opportunity to see it. Now, I want to say to my colleague from Texas that his speech to-day will have to be a good deal closer to the facts than his speech yesterday—there was so much airiness and fog in it—if in 20 minutes he hopes to explain this rule so that we can understand it. He never explained it yesterday. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I am entirely clear that the fact that the gentleman did not understand my explanation yesterday can not be attributed to me.

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; it was the Lord that made him. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CALLAWAY. I want to say this to the gentleman: I would like to understand the rule, but I know that I can not understand a rule which is as long as that concern which was read from the desk there upon any 20-minute explanation; and there are 27 things, as I understand, in this bill that they are trying to save with this rule from points of objection. Those would have to be explained before we could know whether we wanted this rule or not, and it does occur to me, knowing now that we can not do anything on it to-night, that it should go over. If this rule could be printed, and we could study the rule and the bill, instead of somebody's explanation of it, then we could come back here with an understanding of it if we did not understand it before.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to vote on this rule.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] moves that the House adjourn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold that motion for a moment?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Yes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will state that it will be impracticable to bring the rule up until some time about the 1st of January, if it goes over now.

Mr. MANN. We might as well take a full holiday recess.

Mr. HENRY. And we probably would not have a quorum here right after the holidays. I would not like to press it upon any single Member here. I have the highest regards and feelings for every single one of you on both sides. It is not a personal matter with me at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the motion to adjourn.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] withheld his motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas withdraw his motion to adjourn?

Mr. CALLAWAY. No; I am simply withholding it.

Mr. MANN. You can not withhold it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not withhold his motion.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I simply withheld it. I am not withdrawing it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is to vote on this rule.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has the floor.

Mr. HENRY. I yield the floor, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANN. He did not have the floor, Mr. Speaker. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] moved to adjourn.

Mr. HENRY. I had moved the previous question prior to that, and then he withdrew his motion.

Mr. MANN. We understood it otherwise.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I was simply withholding that motion to adjourn. I did not intend to withdraw it. I insist on it. I move that the House adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves the previous question and his colleague [Mr. CALLAWAY] moves to adjourn. The motion to adjourn takes precedence over the other motion. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] to adjourn.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEFLIN. When the House reconvenes will the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] for the previous question be the first thing in order?

The SPEAKER. No. The question is on agreeing to the motion to adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. CALLAWAY and Mr. BARTLETT demanded a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded. The Chair will count. Those in favor of the motion to adjourn will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Ninety-six gentlemen have risen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-three gentlemen have risen in the negative. On this vote the yeas are 96 and the noes are 123, and the House refuses to adjourn. The question is on the motion for the previous question.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—yeas 118, noes 98.

Accordingly the previous question was ordered.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this rule is practically the same rule presented to the House on yesterday, with three of four important changes. In the first place, everything pertaining to the reduction of salaries of postmasters is eliminated from it; second, everything pertaining to abolishing the positions of assistant postmasters is eliminated from this special rule; third, everything pertaining to experimenting in one county of each State toward letting out the Rural Mail Service by contract is taken from the rule and is not now included within its provisions. Those are the omissions, and they seemed to be the things that were obstacles in the way of the adoption of this rule on yesterday.

Then we include the balance of the provisions of the rule offered yesterday, and one of the main provisions is section 11, in regard to fixing the compensation of the railroads for carrying the mails. That is in the special rule, so that it may be considered by the House when we again take up the Post Office appropriation bill. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is it not a fact that the provision originally proposed by the Postmaster General abolishing the office of assistant postmaster in first and second class offices was never in the bill, and that it was not in the rule of yesterday, but that, on the contrary, the appropriation for assistant postmasters is omitted from the bill?

Mr. HENRY. Whatever was in there with reference to it has been omitted from the rule.

Mr. STEENERSON. But the rule does cover a number of new positions—superintendent of finance, superintendent of mail delivery, and so forth.

Mr. HENRY. I will let the gentlemen on the Post Office Committee discuss that.

Mr. STEENERSON. I thought you wanted to understand what the rule was.

Mr. HENRY. Oh, I know what the rule is.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other important provision left in the rule that I think should be called to the attention of the House, and that is in regard to the increase of the salaries of rural carriers \$100 per annum. That, I think, is in section 24 of the rule as reported.

A MEMBER. Section 23.

Mr. HENRY. It is 23 of the bill but 24 of the rule. So that will not be subject to a point of order, and we can come squarely to a vote on it.

But over and above all these things, everything that is in this rule simply makes certain provisions of the bill the subject of legislation. It enables the House to consider them, and if there is anything in this rule that you wish not to be made a part of the Post Office appropriation bill, you can vote it down on its merits and the bill can be amended with the utmost freedom, and all these things that the rule touches can be amended and discussed; and if it is the sense of the House that not a single one of these things shall be included in the Post Office appropriation bill, you have the power by a majority vote to strike it out, and there is nothing to hinder you from doing that.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I do.

Mr. CALLAWAY. The effect of this will be to make a majority vote sustain every raise of salary, while the reduction of salaries could be made even if this rule were not adopted, because under the Holman rule a majority vote can reduce salaries.

Mr. HENRY. Oh, yes; that is quite true; and I want to say to my colleague from Texas—

Mr. CALLAWAY. Now, as I understand your explanation of it, this raises the salaries of rural carriers \$100 a year?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; it authorizes it.

Mr. CALLAWAY. That provision otherwise would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. But this rule protects that, so that a point of order will not cut it out?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; but the House can cut it out.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Oh, no; it can not—not this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. HENRY. Oh, yes. Now, I have answered the gentleman's question, and I can not yield any further. If the gentleman wants to make a motion to strike out all after the enacting clause in the bill he can do it, and if he can get a majority of the House to vote with him there is no trouble about that.

Mr. CALLAWAY. One further question. I understood that this was claimed to be an economy bill. I can not understand why an economy bill wants to protect all the salaries that are raised, while all the others would be subject to be reduced by a majority vote under the Holman rule, just as much as they would if this rule should pass.

Mr. HENRY. Of course the gentleman understands that such amendment would allow a reduction anyhow.

Mr. CALLAWAY. I know that this rule would not affect them, and this rule only affects salaries that are raised.

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman understands that proposition thoroughly, and so do I. If he is not pleased with any item in the bill, he can move to strike it out. If he does not like the raise in the salaries of rural carriers, he can move to make it less and have the judgment of the committee on it.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. OGLESBY. I understood the gentleman to state that the things which had been left out of the bill were the only things that were objected to on the vote yesterday.

Mr. HENRY. I thought so.

Mr. OGLESBY. The RECORD shows, and it accords with my recollection, that the gentleman stated yesterday that the only protest or opposition coming to the Committee on Rules as to the special rule came exclusively from the railroad influence in the United States. The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, also made a statement, in substance, that the Democrats who voted against the rule did so because they were influenced by the railroads. Now, I want to ask if those provisions of the bill which were objectionable to the railroads and which both gentlemen said were the cause of the vote against the rule have been omitted from the rule?

Mr. HENRY. I hope the gentleman will not pursue that question any further, because I understand that the entire House is in favor of the railway-mail provision, and we want to get a vote on it this afternoon. I did state that when the committee was considering the rule no member made any objection like that, but a protest did come from the outside, to which the committee paid no attention. I never made any reflection on any member of the committee, and I would not do it now.

Mr. OGLESBY. I have no intention of pursuing the matter further; I simply wanted to ask the gentleman the question.

Mr. HENRY. I have no objection to answering it, and I suppose the gentleman will vote to adjust this railway-mail pay.

Mr. OGLESBY. I will vote in a way that I think right, independent of the gentleman's supposition.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. The proposition is, as I understand, to permit an amendment to the bill increasing the rural carrier's salary \$100 a year.

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. In addition to the increase that we gave them last spring?

Mr. HENRY. Yes; I think that did pass.

Mr. BURNETT. Was it not on account of a construction put upon it by the Postmaster General, and did it not, in fact, pass?

Mr. HENRY. I understood that for some reason they did not get the increase, and this is to remedy the obstacle.

Mr. BURNETT. But we did increase it last spring by law?

Mr. HENRY. The gentleman can clarify that by offering an amendment in the committee.

Mr. BURNETT. If we increased it last spring, why have they not been getting the pay?

Mr. HENRY. I do not know about that.

Mr. BURNETT. Does it take a second law to enforce the first law when we gave it to them?

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to make any accusations against the Postmaster General or the administration, and I am not going to do it, but I would like to see the carriers get this increase.

Mr. BURNETT. I would like to know who is responsible for their not getting it, and why it takes a second law to enforce a law that has already been passed.

Mr. HENRY. I am afraid the question would be a good deal like the one, "Who struck Billy Patterson?" I do not know.

Mr. BURNETT. And the carriers do not know, and the carriers would like to know, who, in fact, did strike Billy Patterson.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I occupied?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERLEY). The gentleman has occupied 10 minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has now explained this rule, and I want to ask you honestly, you Democrats, how many of you understand any more about it now than you did before?

A MEMBER. All of us.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated that yesterday there was a lack of understanding about what the rule contained. There was, Mr. Speaker; but when the roll call was completed a number of gentlemen then began to understand what the rule did contain, and they hurried down and changed their votes.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the first time since the Democrats came into power in this House that a rule proposed by them was defeated. It is a subject of congratulation, not for the Republican side, not for the Republican Party, but for the country, that the rule was defeated [applause on the Republican side], for the public interest was served by doing it. I want to remind you gentlemen across the aisle of this fact now, that you came in, as you generally do, and blindly followed your leaders in voting for any rule that they propose, and now you see that by being independent, by having minds of your own, the heavens do not fall when you defeat a rule. You have a demonstration that because you defeated this rule yesterday you forced the Committee on Rules to another session and eliminated at least one vicious provision in the rule that you have been castigated for voting against yesterday. I hope this will be a lesson to you in the future and that you will exhibit more independence in the future than you have in the past.

Mr. OGLESBY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. OGLESBY. The gentleman stated that the heavens did not fall; but does not the gentleman think that the nether and upper worlds were brought a little closer together, nevertheless? It raised hell, a little?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; that may be. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], after the rule was defeated and general debate began, castigated you Democrats, and tried to put the railroad sign on you, and now the Committee on Rules has brought out another rule, and there is only one change made that is of value and that is the one with reference to contracts for rural delivery. They now expect, because of that castigation which you received last night from the chairman of the committee, that they are going to drive you back into the coop, you men who voted against the rule yesterday because of fear of being branded with railroad domination. [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] We shall see very shortly whether you men who voted against this rule, not because of some particular item in it, but because of the principle involved of legislating in wholesale on appropriation bills, can be

whipped into line merely because the chairman of the committee last night falsely accused you of being dominated by railroads.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word about this railway-mail-pay proposition, but that is not the only thing in the bill. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CALLAWAY] a moment or two ago said, every reduction in salary in this bill can be adopted under the Holman rule, and that is the principal part of this rule which has been eliminated. The first two pages of it apply to reduction of salaries of postmasters, and, so far as increases are concerned, none of them could be adopted without this rule, so that when you vote for this rule you are voting to make in order every increase in salary which would be subject to a point of order if the rule were not adopted. With reference to his railway-mail proposition, I touched upon that yesterday, and I want to touch upon it again this afternoon. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] in his speech last night, in addition to berating the Democrats who voted against the rule, said this:

Who is it that does not know the power and influence that has prevented the consideration in the Senate of the United States of this railway-mail-pay proposition?

He thereby inferentially charged that the railroads of the country dominated the Democratic majority in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is as untrue and as baseless as was the charge that railroad influence actuated the motives of you men on that side of the aisle who voted against the rule yesterday; but if it be true, Mr. Speaker, that the railroads of the country control the majority in the Senate, that is an additional reason why this rule should not be adopted, because if they do no Member of this House is so simple-minded as to believe that if this proposition goes into the bill and goes over to the Senate it will come back in conference as this House wants it written. Every Member knows that if it goes into the bill at all it must be as a compromise proposition, if the charge of the gentleman from Tennessee as to railway domination is true, and when that conference report is presented at midnight on the 3d day of March we will have no opportunity to know what that compromise proposition is. It will not be printed in the RECORD and we will not have an opportunity to vote it up or vote it down in the House, as I said yesterday, unless we wish to assume the responsibility for a special session of Congress, and I for one do not wish to do that.

One other observation, Mr. Speaker. When the Committee on the Post Office, or any other committee having to do with appropriations, reports an appropriation bill containing new legislation such as this one does, that committee owes it to the House in their report upon that bill to give the House some information as to what that new legislation is. I hold in my hand the report of the Committee on Post Offices, and what do they say about the 37 pages of new legislation, now 35 pages in the rule that we are now asked to vote upon? This is what they say:

It is not necessary to discuss here the new legislation asked for in the bill, as it will be presented for discussion in the House if a rule making it in order be adopted.

Special reference is made to the report of the Postmaster General in explanation of that portion of the new legislation which this committee has seen proper to adopt and recommend for passage in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I assert that when any committee reports new legislation to a large extent, as this committee has, before the House should vote a special rule for its consideration that committee should be required in its report to give the House full information of what the new legislation is, and that committee ought to be required to give some reasons in its report why it should be adopted. So, Mr. Speaker, upon the same grounds that this side voted against the rule yesterday, it will vote against it to-day, because it is wrong in principle and a practice that should not be tolerated by the House.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the special rule on yesterday, and I did not do it because I was in ignorance of what it contained, but I did it deliberately because I did know what it contained. I did not vote against that rule because I was opposed to that railway mail pay provision of the Post Office appropriation bill, for I voted for a similar bill last summer and expect to support that portion of the present bill if it is made in order. But I voted against that special rule, principally, because it made in order a provision contained in the Post Office bill which I believe, if not intended to do so, would have the effect of destroying the present valuable and efficient rural mail-delivery system of this country. I do not hesitate to say that I will vote every day and every time I have a chance against any special rule or any other proposition proposed

which I believe will have the effect of tearing down and destroying the rural mail service of this country. [Applause.] Therefore I have no apologies to make for my vote on yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Rural Mail Service is the greatest boon that the farmers and others who live in the rural districts have ever enjoyed. In fact, this service is about the only direct and immediate benefit that the farmers of this country have ever enjoyed at the hands of the Federal Government. They contribute the major part of the taxes that make up the money with which the expenses of the Government are met, and if they are willing to pay for this service we ought to be willing to give it to them.

We who live in the cities and larger towns have our mail laid on our desks or handed in at the front doors of our homes from two to four times each day at Government expense, and yet there seems to be those somewhat in authority who would deny those living in the rural districts mail once a day.

But the proponents of this new system say that they do not want to deny the farmers this service, but that they want to put it under the contract system, like the old star routes, because it would be cheaper. It would doubtless cost the Government less per year and the service would likely be cheaper—in fact, so cheap that it would be practically worthless, and in the end would be more costly.

My opinion is that instead of having a daily mail, as we now have, on these routes we would have tridaily mail—that is, come one day and try to come the next.

Those of us who have had the opportunity of knowing something about the old contract system in practice with the star routes know that it is so bad, so miserable, that you can not justly dignify it with the name of mail service.

Whether it is the purpose of the proponents of this contract system to eventually destroy the present rural mail system I can not say, but I believe it would have that effect; hence I am bitterly opposed to it, and will oppose it at every turn of the road.

For years every man who gave any serious thought to the trend of affairs in this country knows that one of the alarming situations has been a disposition of our young folks to leave the farms and go to the cities. Every person who wants to see the country develop morally and materially deplores that tendency, and yet we all know that this is due largely to the fact that rural life is too secluded, unattractive, and disadvantageous.

The remedy is apparent. Make rural life attractive, give the people the necessary advantages, and you will largely, if not entirely, stop this exodus from the farms.

Nothing has been done in your lifetime or mine that has done more to make the country life attractive than the rural mail system, which enables these good people to get their daily papers, market reports, and other mail delivered to their doors each day. With this service goes the improvement of the country roads, the building of culverts, bridges, and so forth.

I declare to you now that it is to the rural districts and not the cities we must look, as we have ever had to look, for the real moral and material strength of our beloved country. Then why haggle over a little expense? No braver, more loyal, or truer soldiers ever followed the flag of their country than the boys in uniform who carry the mail through rain and shine, heat and cold, day by day, to the doors of the farmers of this country.

Why try to cripple this splendid service? I for one am not willing to do anything to injure it, much less to destroy it, but on the other hand, am willing to do everything I can to extend and improve it.

By defeating that rule yesterday we have forced the Rules Committee to bring in another rule which eliminates this attempt to injure this mail service, and therefore I am now willing to vote for this present rule, and hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall not try to have anyone believe I understand all contained in this rule. I do desire to be understood as saying that when a committee which has served us well for so long asks us to agree to a proposition to give an opportunity to consider some legislation that is asked for by the Postmaster General, who has conducted his department so well that it has not only paid its own way but made money for us besides, I think it is our duty to at least give the House an opportunity to do what he wants us to do. We observed our Republican friends on the other side yesterday and to-day enjoy themselves very much because for a moment we grew irritable and disagreed with each other, but I can call to their attention a scene of only a couple of years ago when the air was filled with splinters and slivers from their hulk far

over and beyond what happened to us on yesterday. I desire to, if I may to-day, urge my friends in the House to overlook the irritability of yesterday. All of us grow irritable sometimes, all of us make mistakes sometimes; but let me ask of my colleagues on this side, if I have any influence here, not to please our friends over there, whom we love personally, but whom we must protect ourselves against politically. I repeat, our personal affection for our Republican brethren is still radiant and sincere, still we can not in a moment of temper hand out our very vitals to them politically. I have affection for many of them personally, but politically we must of necessity stop, look, and listen. I beg of my friends to stand by the committee and support this rule. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to use some time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Democrats when they come to cast their votes to-day will stop and listen. Yesterday they had their eyes opened, but only opened partially, and to-day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has not added to their enlightenment. Yesterday in his speech the gentleman from Texas used this language:

This is the same rule that was presented to this House during the last session and adopted without a division—

Showing his profound ignorance of the rule that was adopted then, because it only contained 10 of the provisions that are contained in this rule. Here yesterday we had 27 reasons why we should not incorporate it into this appropriation bill. To-day they come in here and leave 24 reasons why you should not have it incorporated. They withdraw the very provisions that should prompt you as Democrats, if you are consistent to your platform promises, to refuse to follow the recommendation now. They withdraw the reduction in postmasters' salaries amounting to \$500,000, but they allow to remain in the rule the increases of salaries for supervisory officials in large cities amounting to \$600,000.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. STAFFORD. I have not time to yield. If you will give me time I shall be glad to do so. They reject the provision for the assistant postmasters, which we do not believe should be removed by indirection. You refuse to remove them by direction and we to-day stand by our guns and say you should not remove them now by this method, by a system which enables any postmaster to remove the assistant in first-class offices and which makes no provision for any assistant postmasters in second-class post offices. Who knows anything about that provision by which you are granting authority to the Postmaster General to discontinue every one of the smaller post offices in your district and make them an adjunct to the office at the county seat? Who are you? I ask you to stand up. And yet there is a provision in this bill that grants that authority. It has been opposed for years in the Post Office Committee, and yet in this bill you are going to vote authority to bring it about. Do you know about it?

On this side we are not afraid of the false charge made by the chairman of the committee that we are actuated by railroad influences. Why, I can brush that aside in a minute, and show the inconsistency of the chairman, because in this very bill, with a unanimous report of the committee, we authorize an increase to the railroads of more than a million and a quarter of dollars to carry the parcel post. If his assertion made yesterday in the heat of anger is true, that under the present system we are paying the railroads two to four millions of dollars more than we should, which he termed "a steal," where is his consistency when he adopts, without dissent—yes, with approval—the provision paying them one million and a quarter dollars more for the carrying of the parcel-post mail?

There is a provision here for the establishment of village delivery. Oh, are you going to abandon that which the Post Office Department recommends, which will amount to a saving of hundreds of thousands of dollars, authorizing the use of rural carriers, so that when they perform only six and one-half hours of service a day they may be required to perform an hour and a half additional service, not in excess of eight hours, at an increased salary of \$150, because you will not stand up for recommendations that will allow real economy, but favor an expensive separate carrier service for villages. Are you going to abandon that? Yesterday there was a provision in this bill which the Post Office Department itself resisted, that was put in the bill without recommendation. And there are others here which deserve thorough consideration, but which can not be had in an

appropriation bill, and especially in a short session, when the rule is to gloss over matters.

We resist the adoption of this rule for the same reason as on yesterday. It is wrong in principle to place as riders on an appropriation bill 23 diverse and separate provisions, many of the greatest importance. I repeat the prophecy again, that much of this important legislation, if ever agreed to by the Senate, will be rushed through the House on the adoption of a conference report in the closing hours of this Congress, when Members will not be alert to study the significance of the changes. This practice is destructive of the deliberative character of this House, and the rule should be defeated to protect the House against such happenings.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, as the propositions that we fought over yesterday are eliminated, that which refers to the third and fourth class postmasters and the rural carriers, I shall cheerfully support this rule this afternoon, and I think Democrats on this side generally will do so. I will not permit the mistake of any Democrat on this side who loses his temper to cause me to do anything that will injure the Democratic Party and its great working force in this House in the interest of the American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I will not permit the joy manifested by the Republican side in what they think was a breach on this side to cause me to line up with them even if some one man on this side makes a mistake.

The Democratic Party is serving the people of this country, Mr. Speaker. We are doing a great work, and one of the great things that has helped us to do this work is standing solidly together—doing teamwork. We propose to continue that sort of work. We will get over any temporary blunder that any Member here may make, but you will never get over the blunders you have made for 16 years. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Upon the breast of your party is branded the scarlet letter of deceit and unfaithfulness to the American people, and you will not be able to get that off. This side will stand in solid Democratic harmony and unity, with Democratic enthusiasm, and we will give you this rule now in about a couple of minutes. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] has five minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has four.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I voted "nay" on the resolution yesterday. I believe this rule ought to be defeated today, because, as I said when I asked that it go over to Monday, there is so much embraced in it that I doubt if half of the Members of this House are familiar with what it contains. And I want to say that the reason I voted against the rule yesterday was the information that came to me from the committee that there were from 25 to 30 amendments to the bill proposed in the rule, and that, to use his own words, if they were permitted to go in there was so much devilment in them that the Congress—the House and the Senate—would probably dillydally over it for two or three months and we would have an extra session of Congress. I am opposed to another extra session of Congress, and so is the country. [Applause.] And, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that my motives in voting as I did yesterday were just as pure as those of the head of a great committee of this House, who stood in this House and stigmatized his colleagues, who are his equals, if not his superiors in honest intentions, by uttering charges which he can not substantiate. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] is recognized for one minute.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I am exceedingly glad to find that our friends are pretty well united on this rule.

Mr. BURNETT. They have reformed. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. There is nothing in this rule except some administrative propositions, which I think no one will object to, and questions that have heretofore been passed upon, almost unanimously, by the House.

I hope the rule will be adopted, and I take pleasure in acknowledging my accord completely with my friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. I am glad that he is feeling better [laughter], and I wish I had a little more time for my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], because I know that he would then feel good, too. [Laughter.]

I do not desire to discuss the rule any further than to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing in this rule that any man

on either side, Democrat or Republican, could fear, because it is an administrative proposition for the betterment of the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] to use the remainder of his time.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted for the rule to permit the consideration of certain proposed legislation on this bill. When the rule was presented, I was engaged in the Committee on Appropriations in the preparation of the urgent deficiency bill. Had I been in the House I should have sought an opportunity to amend the rule by providing for the consideration of a provision which I believe of very great importance.

I have just voted against ordering the previous question on the pending rule. The rule as now presented proposes that more than 20 independent and separate legislative provisions shall have consideration while the Post Office appropriation bill is before the House. Yesterday the rule provided for the consideration, notwithstanding the rules to which they are obnoxious, of 25 legislative provisions.

Since it is proposed to make the Post Office appropriation bill the vehicle of so much general legislation, I believe opportunity should be given to consider a legislative provision as important as any enumerated in the rule.

The legislation recommended for incorporation in the pending bill is based upon the recommendations found in the annual report of the Postmaster General. One question of great importance is discussed in that report unaccompanied by recommendation. The legislation needed to cure the evils discussed, however, is easily apparent.

Under the heading "Obscene and scurrilous matter" the Postmaster General discusses the situation with relation to certain publications which deal with certain questions "in a manifestly coarse, defamatory, and scurrilous manner, and in which many of the statements are alleged to be false and libelous."

The report reviews at some length the laws relative to the exclusion of matter from the mails, and the constructions placed upon such laws by the Federal courts. It appears that under the law as it exists postmasters and other postal officials are required to submit to the department matter about which they are in doubt regarding the right to transmission through the mails. Frequently issues of publications have been sent through the mails before the question is raised and determined, and then the only redress is to remit the matter to the proper United States district attorney for action, which seems to be an ineffective method of dealing with certain abuses.

The Postmaster General asserts that—

Careful examination has been made of all matter submitted by postmasters and others in advance of its transmission, through the mails, but it has been found impossible under the law to exclude much of it, which, even though defamatory, scurrilous, false, and libelous, is not obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, and indecent under the construction placed by the courts upon these terms as used in the statute.

It seems that the leading case is *Swearingen v. United States* (161 U. S., 466). That was a criminal case, and although the publication was excessively coarse, vulgar, abusive, scurrilous, defamatory, and libelous, yet it was held that although the language was "exceedingly coarse and vulgar, and, as applied to an individual, plainly libelous," it was not of a "lewd, lascivious, and obscene tendency, calculated to corrupt and debauch the mind and morals of those into whose hands it might fall."

This decision was based upon the provisions of a penal statute prohibiting the use of the mails for circulating matter to corrupt the morals of the people. Yet it is readily apparent that much may be published that would not come within the purview of such a statute which would still be unfit to circulate through the mails.

After a careful examination of the existing laws, I have prepared a provision conferring upon the Postmaster General authority which it is asserted he does not possess, but which I believe he should have. I desired to amend this rule to permit consideration of the provision as an amendment to the pending bill. The amendment I should offer if I had the opportunity is as follows:

If it be established to the satisfaction of the Postmaster General that any person is engaged, or represents himself as engaged, in the business of publishing any obscene or immoral books, pamphlets, pictures, prints, engravings, lithographs, photographs, or other publication, matter, or thing of an indecent, immoral, scurrilous, or libelous character; and if such person shall, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, endeavor to use the post office for the promotion of his business, it is hereby declared that no letter, package, parcel, newspaper, book, or other thing sent, or sought to be sent, through the post office by or on behalf

of or to or on behalf of such person shall be deemed mallable matter; and the Postmaster General shall make the necessary rules and regulations to exclude such nonmallable matter from the mails.

I doubt if anyone could urge a legitimate objection to such legislation. It requires the establishment of the fact that a person is engaged, or represents himself as engaged, in the business of publishing obscene or immoral books, pamphlets, pictures, and so forth, or other publication of an indecent, immoral, scurrilous, or libelous character, and if, in the opinion of the Postmaster General, the person engaged in such a business, or representing himself to be so engaged, endeavors to use the mails to promote that business the right to use the mails is taken from him. Surely it will not be urged that the mails should be used for such a purpose. There has been much just and well-founded complaint about the contents of a number of publications circulated through the mails. I have seen some of these publications. The contents of some of them are so indecent, scurrilous, and offensive in character as to arouse the resentment and indignation of all intelligent and self-respecting citizens of the United States.

The existing law to exclude such publications from the mails apparently is inadequate. Ample authority should be lodged in the proper officials to eliminate the abuses which now exist. The law providing for the exclusion of publications the wrapper of which contains obscene or lewd or libelous matter is wholly inadequate. The wrapper may be inoffensive and the contents exceedingly vile and coarse, yet even if within the purview of the penal law no effective remedy now exists to prevent recurring circulation of such matter in successive issues of a publication.

I repeat this power to regulate gross abuses of the mail should be lodged in some official. If it does not now exist, it should be given. Since such a considerable volume of legislation is to be considered upon this bill I believe an opportunity should be given to consider the provision which I have suggested. As a protest against the inability to have an opportunity to present an amendment to the rule which would permit the consideration of such a provision while the bill is before the House, I shall reverse my action of yesterday and vote against the rule, and I shall endeavor in some other way to have this provision considered and enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD briefly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, last summer the House passed a bill providing for a revision of the laws relating to railway mail pay. That bill went to the Senate, where it is now reposing. The other day the Post Office Committee reported to the House the annual appropriation bill, containing as one of its items the identical language concerning the revision of the law on railway mail pay that was contained in the bill passed by the House last summer and now pending in the Senate.

Yesterday the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], chairman of this great Post Office Committee, which makes the largest appropriation reported by any committee of the House, deliberately stated on the floor of the House that the bill which we passed last summer was being held up in the Senate through railroad influences, and that the Democratic Members of the House who voted against the rule yesterday, making this provision in order in the appropriation bill, were being controlled or influenced by railroad influences.

Mr. MOON. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. MANN. Is the charge true or false? Was it mere buncombe or is it true? If it is not true, the House ought to repudiate the charge and condemn the man who made it. [Applause.] If the charge be true, the House owes it to itself to investigate the charge and to put punishment upon those who are controlled by railroad influences in their votes in the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has two minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, ordinarily when some one says I am "grossly ignorant" about anything I do not feel offended. That might be my misfortune. But when the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] thinks, and imagines he thinks, he can discover that I am grossly ignorant, then I feel that it is time for me to sit up and take notice. [Applause and

laughter.] And sometimes I feel as though I ought to be offended; but when I look at him I can not have any malice against him. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, permit me to say that there are too many charges made against public men in this country. I do not believe that there is a Member on that side of the House or on this side who can be corruptly influenced by railroads or any other influence in this country. [Applause.] I believe the Representatives in the American Congress are men of the very highest type of integrity and honor; and if anything has occurred in the course of this debate wherein my remarks might be considered as a reflection upon my colleagues on this side or that, I freely withdraw them and wish to assure them that I have confidence in each and every one of them and genuine affection for all. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 97, answered "present" 0, not voting 159, as follows:

YEAS—172.

Abercrombie	Dixon	Humphreys, Miss.	Reilly, Conn.
Adair	Donovan	Igoe	Reilly, Wis.
Adamson	Doollittle	Jacaway	Rouse
Aiken	Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Rubey
Alexander	Dupré	Johnson, S. C.	Russell
Allen	Evans	Keating	Sabath
Aswell	Faison	Kent	Shackleford
Austin	Fergusson	Kettner	Sherwood
Ballay	Ferris	Key, Ohio	Sisson
Baker	Fields	Kirkpatrick	Slayden
Barkley	Finley	Kitchin	Small
Beakes	FitzHenry	Lafferty	Smith, N. Y.
Borchers	Floyd, Ark.	Lazaro	Smith, Tex.
Borland	Foster	Lee, Ga.	Sparkman
Brockson	Fowler	Lee, Pa.	Stanley
Buchanan, Ill.	Gallagher	Lieb	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gard	Lloyd	Stephens, Nebr.
Burgess	Garner	Lobeck	Stephens, Tex.
Burke, Wis.	Garrett, Tex.	Lomergan	Stone
Burnett	Gill	McGillcuddy	Stout
Byrnes, S. C.	Gilmore	McKellar	Stringer
Byrnes, Tenn.	Goeke	Madden	Summers
Candler, Miss.	Goodwin, Ark.	Maguire, Nebr.	Tavener
Cantrill	Gordon	Mahan	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Goulden	Mitchell	Thacher
Carlin	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Thomas
Carr	Gray	Moon	Thompson, Okla.
Carter	Gudger	Morgan, La.	Tribble
Church	Hamlin	Morrison	Tuttle
Clark, Fla.	Hardy	Mulkey	Underhill
Collier	Harrison	Murray	Underwood
Connelly, Kans.	Hay	Oldfield	Vaughan
Connolly, Iowa	Hayden	O'Shaunessy	Vinson
Conry	Healin	Padgett	Watkins
Cox	Helm	Park	Watson
Crisp	Helvering	Peterson	Weaver
Crosser	Henry	Phelan	Webb
Cullop	Hensley	Pou	Whaley
Decker	Holland	Quin	White
Dent	Houston	Ragsdale	Williams
Dershem	Hoxworth	Raney	Wingo
Dickinson	Hughes, Ga.	Raker	Witherspoon
Dies	Hull	Rayburn	Young, Tex.

NAYS—97.

Anderson	Frear	McKenzie	Sherley
Avis	Gillett	MacDonald	Sinnott
Barnhart	Good	Maahan	Sloan
Bartholdt	Greene, Mass.	Mann	Smith, Idaho
Barton	Greene, Vt.	Mapes	Smith, J. M. C.
Bell, Cal.	Guernsey	Mondell	Smith, Minn.
Browne, Wis.	Hayes	Morgan, Okla.	Stafford
Bryan	Helgesen	Moss, Ind.	Steenerson
Burke, S. Dak.	Hill	Mott	Stephens, Cal.
Callaway	Hinds	Nelson	Stevens, Minn.
Cary	Hinebaugh	Norton	Sutherland
Chandler, N. Y.	Howell	Oglesby	Switzer
Cline	Humphrey, Wash.	Page, N. C.	Talcott, N. Y.
Coady	Kahn	Paige, Mass.	Temple
Cooper	Keister	Parker, N. J.	Thomson, Ill.
Cramton	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. Y.	Treadway
Curry	Kelly, Pa.	Patton, Pa.	Volstead
Danforth	Kennedy, Iowa	Plumley	Walters
Davis	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter	Willis
Dillon	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Prouty	Woodruff
Esch	La Follette	Rauch	Woods
Farr	Langham	Roberts, Nev.	Young, N. Dak.
Fess	Langley	Rogers	
Fitzgerald	Lenroot	Rupley	
Fordney	Lindbergh	Scott	

NOT VOTING—159.

Ainey	Blackmon	Brumbaugh	Claypool
Ansberry	Bocher	Bulkeley	Copley
Anthony	Bowdie	Burke, Pa.	Dale
Ashbrook	Britten	Butler	Davenport
Baltz	Brodbeck	Caldier	Deltrick
Barchfeld	Broussard	Campbell	Difenderfer
Bartlett	Brown, N. Y.	Cantor	Donohoe
Bathrick	Brown, W. Va.	Carew	Dooling
Beall, Tex.	Browning	Casey	Doremus
Bell, Ga.	Bruckner	Clancy	Driscoll

Drukker	Hamilton, N. Y.	Logue	Rucker
Dunn	Hammond	McAndrews	Saunders
Eagan	Harris	McClellan	Scully
Eagle	Hart	McGuire, Okla.	Seldomridge
Edmonds	Haugen	McLaughlin	Sells
Edwards	Hawley	Maher	Shreve
Elder	Hobson	Martin	Sims
Estopinal	Howard	Metz	Slemp
Fairchild	Hughes, W. Va.	Miller	Smith, Md.
Falconer	Hullings	Moore	Smith, Saml. W.
Flood, Va.	Johnson, Utah	Morin	Stedman
Francis	Johnson, Wash.	Moss, W. Va.	Stevens, N. H.
French	Jones	Murdock	Taggart
Gallivan	Kennedy, Conn.	Neeley, Kans.	Talbott, Md.
Gardner	Kiess, Pa.	Neely, W. Va.	Taylor, Ala.
Garrett, Tenn.	Kindel	Nolan, J. I.	Taylor, Colo.
George	Kinkad, N. J.	O'Brien	Taylor, N. Y.
Gerry	Knowland, J. R.	O'Hair	Ten Eyck
Gittins	Konop	O'Leary	Townsend
Glass	Korby	Palmer	Vare
Godwin, N. C.	Kreider	Patten, N. Y.	Vollmer
Goldfogle	L'Engle	Peters	Walker
Gorman	Leshner	Platt	Wallin
Graham, Pa.	Lever	Post	Walsh
Green, Iowa	Levy	Powers	Whitacre
Gregg	Lewis, Md.	Price	Wilson, Fla.
Griest	Lewis, Pa.	Reed	Wilson, N. Y.
Griffin	Lindquist	Riordan	Winslow
Hamill	Linthicum	Roberts, Mass.	
Hamilton, Mich.	Loft	Rothermel	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

For the session:

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Until further notice:

Mr. DALE with Mr. MARTIN.

Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. SHREVE.

Mr. SIMS with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. MAHER with Mr. POWERS.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PLATT.

Mr. REED with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. MCANDREWS with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. MOORE.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. MILLER.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. JONES with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HART with Mr. JOHNSON of Washington.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. JOHNSON of Utah.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. GREGG with Mr. HAWLEY.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. HAUGEN.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. EAGLE with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. DEITRICK with Mr. COPELEY.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. CLANCY with Mr. CALDER.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. BROWN of West Virginia with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. AINEY.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. WINSLOW.

Mr. WALKER with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. BOOHER with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

On this vote:

Mr. BLACKMON (for the rule) with Mr. GRIEST (against).

Mr. SAUNDERS (for the rule) with Mr. WALLIN (against).

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] have five minutes in which to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of course it affords me pleasure to hear the result of the vote which has just been announced. In the course of the debate in this House in which I participated somewhat, I find that a number of gentlemen feel

aggrieved at some things that I said. That is apparent from the discussion that has taken place this afternoon. I take it that most men in the discussion of a question in an impromptu way, when they are seriously in earnest, speak very seriously, but I was particularly careful, I thought, in the discussion of the facts and the possible legitimate deductions from those facts, in view of the existing circumstances, not to be offensive, and yet I am regarded as having been offensive by a number of gentlemen on both sides.

Although there may be some remarks in that speech that probably are a little too rough and ought not to be in it and for which I am sorry, yet I challenge any man to find anything in the speech in which I called into question the personal honor or the integrity of any man in the House. I asked certain questions in the speech that might indicate it. They were left to be answered in the minds where they found lodgment. I made no charge of personal dishonor in connection with any of these matters or of undue influence. I asked if certain influences existed. I did not say that they were dishonest or undue. I complained of the judgment that was exercised by some of my friends, and that is all; and, if you will notice, the very closing sentence of the speech was to the effect that I made no charge of corruption or dishonesty against any Member of this House, but only challenged their judgment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MOON. Not now. The gentleman declined to yield to me a while ago.

Mr. MANN. I had two minutes in my own right. The gentleman now gets five minutes by my consent.

Mr. MOON. Very well.

Mr. MANN. Referring to the closing sentence of the gentleman's speech, was that in the speech as it was delivered or was it inserted into the speech for the Record?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I was just about to say that that last sentence in the speech was added by myself to assure the House that I meant no charge of that sort. If there is anything in that speech that is offensive to anybody in the House, though I made it in pursuance of what I felt to be my duty, I should be very glad to take it out of the speech. I do not want to offend anybody here. I have no personal antagonism against any man in this House. In fact, my feeling is most kindly to all, but that which was said was said under a sense of duty. If it was said too strongly, if it intimated corruption here, it was not so intended, and I take pleasure in withdrawing it, if such is the view held by any man. Mr. Speaker, my feeling has been most kindly toward all, and I repeat it again, if the feelings of any are hurt in any way by the speech I am very glad to apologize and to withdraw anything in it that is offensive, and when we adjourn I hope that you will have a most happy time with your families at home and return to the discharge of your duties in the very best of humor, as I hope to do. [Applause.]

COMMITTEE ELECTIONS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the following elections to committees, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Nominations for Democratic caucus: WARREN GARD, of Ohio—Judiciary. CARL VINSON, of Georgia—Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Expenditures in Agricultural Department; Pensions. JESSE D. PRICE, of Maryland—Claims; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations? [After a pause.] The question is on the election of these gentlemen to the various committees.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, December 21, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication of the Secretary of War submitting an urgent estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for transportation of the Army and its supplies for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914 (H. Doc. No. 1422), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2824) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1237), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11253) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to the town of Tempe, Ariz., a tract of land containing road-making material, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1239), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. KENT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5990) to authorize the sale and issuance of patent for certain land to William G. Kerckhoff, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1236), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LENROOT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5497) authorizing the issuance of patent to Arthur J. Floyd for section 31, township 22 north, range 22 west of the sixth principal meridian, in the State of Nebraska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1238), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19596) granting a pension to Frank E. Cook; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 20118) granting a pension to Friedericke Potter; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 18323) granting a pension to William Henry Gray; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 18804) granting a pension to John L. Barr; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 20186) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the relinquishment of the State of Wyoming to certain lands heretofore certified to said State, and the State of Wyoming to select other lands in lieu of the lands thus relinquished; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 20187) governing the reclamation of desert-land entries by the planting of trees, etc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 20188) to increase the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 20189) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 20190) for the prevention and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease in cattle and for the payment for cattle destroyed by the United States Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 20191) for the protection of the New York Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ASWELL: A bill (H. R. 20192) to authorize a survey of Little River and tributaries, Castor and Dugdemonia, from the mouth of Little River to Winnfield, La., on the Dugdemonia, and to Olla, La., on the Castor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 20193) providing for the payment of assessments on Indian allotments benefited by the construction of State rural highways in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY: A bill (H. R. 20194) for the construction and equipment of an ammunition manufacturing plant at the United States Arsenal at Benicia, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20195) to appropriate \$10,000 for a highway across the Fort Niobrara Military Reservation and the timber reservation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 20196) to confer jurisdiction on the Federal courts in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Resolution (H. Res. 683) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to Wilbur H. Estey, clerk of the late Hon. EDWIN A. MERRITT, jr., the sum of \$125, being an amount equal to one month's salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 20197) granting an increase of pension to John Sager; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20198) for the relief of Paul Wallerstein; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CULLOP: A bill (H. R. 20199) granting an increase of pension to William H. Gallup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20200) granting an increase of pension to Demcy M. Knight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 20201) granting a pension to H. Aimee Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20202) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Goodman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20203) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Schrawder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20204) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Wolfe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20205) granting an increase of pension to William B. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 20206) granting an increase of pension to Theresa B. Nash; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGAN: A bill (H. R. 20207) for the relief of Herman Holpp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 20208) granting a pension to Dora Heney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20209) granting an increase of pension to Martha Burdett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 20210) granting an increase of pension to Horace J. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILL: A bill (H. R. 20211) for the relief of the Duncan Building & Loan Association of New Jersey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 20212) for the relief of the Home Investment Association of Redlands, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20213) for the relief of the Santa Fe Building Association of San Bernardino, Cal.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20214) granting a pension to W. Irvin Long; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIRKPATRICK: A bill (H. R. 20215) granting an increase of pension to Smith J. Dutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20216) granting an increase of pension to Avery T. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: A bill (H. R. 20217) granting an increase of pension to Emma Gibbone; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 20218) for the payment to J. H. Norris for salary and expenses as inspector and superintendent under the Indian Department; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 20219) granting an increase of pension to William Hinckle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20220) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: A bill (H. R. 20221) granting an increase of pension to William M. Gatchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20222) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20223) granting an increase of pension to Fayette B. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 20224) granting a pension to Sarah E. Campion; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 20225) for the relief of Wilfred J. Drey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 20226) granting a pension to John K. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20227) granting an increase of pension to Noah Collins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 20228) granting a pension to Gertrude M. Haydon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWITZER: A bill (H. R. 20229) granting a pension to Bertha J. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20230) granting a pension to Rufus A. Theis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20231) granting a pension to Cyrus Craton Cassels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20232) granting a pension to Samuel O. McElhaney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20233) granting an increase of pension to Rachel Misner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20234) granting a pension to Margaret J. Essex; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 20235) granting a pension to Elizabeth Adair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 20236) granting an increase of pension to Hannah M. Budd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 20237) granting a pension to Louis E. Laviere; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20238) granting a pension to William E. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODS: A bill (H. R. 20239) granting an increase of pension to Charles B. Mathews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20240) granting a pension to Louisa Fleming; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of students of Columbia University, opposing militarism; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also (by request), petitions of sundry citizens of Macedonia and Fulton, Mo., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also (by request), petition of citizens of Nashport, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Z. E. W. Chester, D. A. Luther, Robert Dillon, P. L. Eck & Son, and C. S. Harbaugh, all of Carrolltown, Pa., favoring passage of H. R. 5308, taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Cambria County Association of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of citizens and churches of Alabama, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Mrs. Henry W. Dixon, Mrs. J. R. Colton, Mrs. H. H. Kieschefer, Mrs. Dan Price, Mrs. J. Gilbertson, Beatrice Gilbertson, Edgar Feurig, Stanley White, Mrs. George Potterton, and John R. Cotton, all of Milwaukee, and members of the Simpson Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of J. M. Nash, 377 Wauwatosa Avenue; E. T. Wright, 383 Wauwatosa Avenue; William R. Nethercut, 110 Warren Avenue; E. N. Lyman, 177 Warren Avenue; Roscoe Moor, 180 Warren Avenue; J. W. Sereekans, 144 Warren Avenue; William A. Hart, 92 Warren Avenue; O. S. Mackinnon, 341 Church Street; William Robertson, 28 Roger Avenue; I. N. Conklin, 302 Church Street; John L. Hart, 309 Wisconsin Ave-

nue; E. A. Swan, Milwaukee, Station B, R. R. 6; M. B. Potter, 505 Wauwatosa Avenue; John C. Potter, 505 Wauwatosa Avenue, all of Wauwatosa, Wis., and I. N. Tume, West Allis, Wis., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of National Board of Steam Navigation, relative to funds for the ships and apparatus required in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petitions of Francis Bayer, George Cushing, and A. B. Moffatt, of New York, favoring bill to prohibit shipment of all war material to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DANFORTH: Petitions of Union Trust Co., Rochester, N. Y.; Piel Bros., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; Retail Liquor Dealers' Association of New York, N. Y.; and Ohio Labor Home Rule Association, of Cincinnati, Ohio, against nation-wide prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of German Methodist Episcopal Church, of Hoboken, N. J., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FARR: Petitions of Scranton (Pa.) Union Christian Endeavor and Westminster Presbyterian Church, of Scranton; Welsh Congregational Churches of northeastern Pennsylvania and Methodist Episcopal Church, of Moosic, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FESS: Petitions of the Mother Thompson Union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Hillsboro, Ohio; Second United Presbyterian Church, of Xenia, Ohio; Maineville, Beach Grove, Sugar Run, and Pleasant Plain Baptist Churches; Dr. R. C. Belt, of Milford, Ohio; Mrs. W. E. Laughlin, of Belle Center, Ohio; the Friends' Church, of Waynesville, Ohio; Rev. H. E. Crowell, of Osborn, Ohio; Methodist Protestant Church, of Cook, Ohio; Methodist Episcopal Church, of Mechanicsburg, Ohio; the Rainsboro (Ohio) Methodist Episcopal Sunday School; the East Liberty (Ohio) Methodist Episcopal Church; Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church, of Springboro, Ohio; Trinity Methodist Church and Sunday School, of Xenia, Ohio; United Presbyterian Church, of Jamestown, Ohio; R. S. Kellerman, of Blanchester, Ohio; South Solon (Ohio) Methodist Church; F. A. McNeill, of Bethel, Ohio; Xenia (Ohio) First Methodist Church; Friends' Church, of Xenia, Ohio; Bert Highlands, of Mechanicsburg, Ohio; and the business committee of the Ohio Sunday School Association, urging the passage of the Hobson amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the Ohio Labor Home Rule Association, opposing the Hobson prohibition resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of J. F. Laird and the Friends' Church at Leesburg, Ohio, indorsing the Sheppard-Hobson bill for national constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Greenfield, Ohio, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILLET: Petitions of 67 organizations, total membership 9,730, of the second congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GILMORE: Petition of 53 organizations, having a total membership of 10,674, in the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of International Union of United Brewery Workmen, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 20166, granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Manley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 16493, granting a pension to William Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULINGS: Petitions, praying for the passage of the national prohibition resolution, by United Presbyterian Church, Grove City, Pa., by W. E. Purvis, pastor; tabernacle builders for Jordan evangelistic campaign, Warren, Pa., by A. F. Kottkamp, chairman campaign executive committee; Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Warren, Pa., by Charles Lewis, chairman temperance commission; Methodist Episcopal Church, Warren, Pa., by William A. Thornton, pastor; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Russell, Pa., by Etta C. Hatton, president; Harmony United Presbyterian Church, Harrisville, Pa., by H. C. Hildebrand, pastor; Rocky Grove (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, by Thomas W. Pearson, pastor; Swedish Congregational Church, Ridgway, Pa., by John Larson, president of board, Oscar W. Nordstrom, secretary, Otto Nelson, pastor; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Ridgway, Pa., by Martha E. Bower, president; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions praying for the passage of the prohibition resolution from the congregations of North Warren Presbyterian Church, by Howard J. Baumgartel, pastor, E. R. Geer, clerk, E. D. Northrup, president, J. E. Hazeltine, secretary; "congregations of both churches," Pittsfield, Pa., by Mrs. E. E. Lynn, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Willard Union, Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Franklin, Pa., by Mrs. K. E. Duffee, corresponding secretary; Presbyterian congregation, Milledge, Pa., by E. C. Dean, clerk; Swedish Mission Church and Sunday School, Johnsonburg, Pa., by superintendent; United Presbyterian Church, Springfield, Pa., by Mrs. D. H. Rogers, president Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Methodist Episcopal Church, Johnsonburg, Pa., by Rev. J. C. Ginader, pastor; Methodist Episcopal Church, Mercer, Pa., by R. F. Randolph, pastor; First Presbyterian Church, Wilcox, Pa.; First Presbyterian Church, Johnsonburg, Pa., by John H. Cooper, pastor; United Presbyterian Church, Greenville, Pa., by Ira G. McCreary, pastor; Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Greenville, Pa., by Mrs. A. E. Bean, president; First Presbyterian Church and Christian Endeavor, Oil City, Pa., by Helen Grove, secretary; Methodist Episcopal Church, Kennard, Pa., by L. W. Chambers, pastor; Methodist Episcopal Church, Marienville, Pa., by G. S. W. Phillips, pastor; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions praying for the passage of the prohibition resolution by Lamont E. Reznor, Mercer; D. R. Mackenzie, S. A. M. Stockwell, F. V. Mallory, John Borland, Arthur Poole, F. W. Hays, Oil City; Ella Keck Morgan, David A. Brown, M. D., Frederick W. Smith, Charles B. Wakefield, Mrs. Charles B. Wakefield, Greenfield, all in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions praying for the passage of the national prohibition resolution by First Presbyterian Church, Mercer, Pa., by John S. Duncan, pastor; First Baptist Church, Ridgway, Pa., by Chester C. Winter, pastor; and W. B. Campbell, Franklin, Pa.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KAHN: Petition of Messrs. Sherwood & Sherwood, Jesse Moore Hunt Co., H. L. Hirsch, W. G. Loewe, L. H. Hirsch, L. H. Greenwood, and the French American Bank of Savings, all of San Francisco, Cal., and the International Union of the United Brewery Workmen of America and the Ohio Labor Home Rule Association, both of Cincinnati, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the Hobson Nation-wide prohibition resolution; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEISTER: Memorial of State body of the Junior Order of United American Mechanics, of Scranton, Pa., favoring passage of H. R. 6060; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petitions favoring national prohibition from Rev. Leroy L. Daniels, Providence, R. I.; Providence (R. I.) Christian Endeavor; First Presbyterian Church, Providence, R. I.; petitions opposing woman suffrage from Mrs. H. E. Yarnell, Newport, R. I.; Mary L. B. Steadman, Providence, R. I.; Mrs. Charles Weaver, Mrs. Joseph Howland, Anne B. Vernon, Abbie Langley, Sallie Manchester, Sarah W. Covell, Mary S. Sheffield, Margaret Sheffield, Mary L. Ives, Mary J. Peckham, Laura B. Peckham, Antoinette S. Peckham, Martha H. Stedman, Annie Bryant, Martha A. Coggeshall, Sarah T. Hammett, Elizabeth P. Burdick, Jane B. Coggeshall, Louise D. Hammett, Sarah P. Landers, Isabella Sanborn, Mary C. Sherman, Louise Arnold, Elizabeth Vernon, Mary W. Case, Susan C. Weaver, and Leonora H. Vernon; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Woonsocket, R. I., and A. Perrigans, of Lincoln, R. I., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: Numerous letters, petitions, and telegrams from residents, churches, Sunday schools, and other organizations of the sixth congressional district of Nebraska, favoring the passage of the Hobson-Sheppard resolution, to permit States to amend the Constitution in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIEB: Petitions of R. A. Cushman, Mrs. Laura Sweetland, and the Princeton Methodist Church, all of Princeton; Christian Endeavor Societies of first district, voiced by Rev. John E. Cox, of Oakland City; Rev. G. A. Smith and Rev. N. L. New, of the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, of Fort Branch; and the Men's Bible Class of the Jefferson Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Evansville, in the State of Indiana, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the Waterbury Branch of the Connecticut Association, opposing woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petitions of the Center Church Methodist Episcopal Sunday School and official church board, East Hartford, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of the City Council of Bristol, Conn., opposing the letting of rural free delivery routes out by contract; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Grace W. Weatherby, East Hartford, Conn., opposing woman suffrage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of members of First Methodist Episcopal Church of Calumet and 1,146 citizens, all of the State of Michigan, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, memorial of members of Local 174, International Association of Machinists, Marquette, Mich., in opposition to the use of stop-watch methods in making a time study of the work of Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of Branch 201, National Association of Civil Service Employees, Grand Rapids, Mich., relative to retirement of aged Government workers; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of Lodge No. 11, International Order of Good Templars, Middletown, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHER: Memorial of officers and members of the Broadway Board of Trade, New York, favoring passage of House bill 5139, the Hamill bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAPES: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Mich., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: Petition of citizens and churches of Parkersburg, Williamstown, Ravenswood, Harrisville, Spencer, Speed, Troy, Ripley, Middlebourne, Walton, Servia, Sutton, Elizabeth, Flatwoods, and Cairo, all in the State of West Virginia, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of Jacob Wiess & Co., Providence, R. I., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Newport (R. I.) branch Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, protesting against suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALMER: Petition of citizens of Bangor, Pa., urging freedom of press; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of executive committee of Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Papers to accompany bill granting increase of pension to William M. Gatchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Fayette B. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of St. Croix Lodge, No. 57, International Order of Good Templars, Calais, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of 90 citizens of Rockport, Ill.; Virginia Women's Club, Virginia, Ill.; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Timewell, Ill.; and 9 churches and church organizations in the twentieth Illinois district, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of citizens of New Haven and West Haven, Conn., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of New Haven Branch of the Connecticut State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, against woman-suffrage amendment; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petitions of 56 church organizations, total membership of 8,397, of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of citizens of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of sundry voters of the fifth Illinois congressional district, protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Petitions of Elkins (W. Va.) Ministerium; national legislative committee, Anti-Saloon League of America; Christian Endeavor, Methodist Protestant Church of Harrisville; Buckley Methodist Episcopal Church, Wheeling; and the Men's Brotherhood, of Weston, W. Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THACHER: Petitions favoring national prohibition from First Baptist Church, Hingham; Congregational Church

and Sunday School, Mettapoisset; Methodist Episcopal Church, Wellfleet; Union Church, Truro; Epworth League and Methodist Episcopal Church, Cotuit; Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, East Wareham; Central Square Church Sunday School, Bridgewater; Memorial Church Sunday School, Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, Plymouth; Baptist Church and Sunday School, Barnstable; Christian Endeavor, Barnstable; Immanuel Baptist Church, New Bedford; Methodist Episcopal Church and Sunday School, Fairhaven; Christian Endeavor, Congregational Sunday School and Church, Middleboro; Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School, East Falmouth; Universalist Sunday School and Methodist Church, Orleans; Baptist and Methodist Episcopal Churches, Sunday Schools, and Epworth League, Nantucket; Baptist Churches, West Tisbury and Vineyard Haven; Congregational Church, Methodist Episcopal Sunday School, Falmouth; Methodist Episcopal Church and Universalist Sunday School, Eastham, all of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petition of citizens of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TUTTLE: Petitions of citizens and churches of Elizabeth, Springfield, Rahway, Rockaway, Westfield, Roselle, Dover, New Providence, Roselle Park, and Summit, all in the State of New Jersey, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VOLLMER: Petition of the Philadelphia branch of the National German-American Alliance, asking that Congress pass the necessary law forthwith that will enable the President of the United States to lay an embargo upon all contraband of war, saving and excepting foodstuffs alone, and thereby withdraw from the contending powers all aid and assistance of this Republic; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER: Memorial of temperance people of Arapahoe and 160 citizens of Crescent, Okla., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of 48 church organizations, total membership of 7,046, of the State of Massachusetts, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Philadelphia branch of the National German-American Alliance, favoring an embargo on the exportation from this country of contraband of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, December 21, 1914.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the truth that Thou hast declared unto men is in itself the covenant that Thou hast made them. We know that our responsibility is alone according to the measure of our ability to know the truth. But Thy truth does not bind; it sets us free.

So far as we follow the truth as Thou dost give us to see the truth, we may be sure of our task, of our happiness, and of our destiny. It is only when we stultify our intellect in refusing to walk in the light that we meet the dark shadow of Thy frown. We are sure of our way not because we can see the end, but because we know that with zeal and fidelity we follow after the truth. Let Thy grace abide with us this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

JAMES H. BRADY, a Senator from the State of Idaho, appeared in his seat to-day.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., December 21, 1914.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. CLAUDE AUGUSTUS SWANSON, a Senator from the State of Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES P. CLARKE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. SWANSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer and directed that the Journal of the last legislative day be read. The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 213) authorizing the

Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of said month.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WHITE. I present a petition from citizens of the city of Attalla, Ala., which I ask may be read and referred to the proper committee.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

A petition to the Senate of the United States.

We, the undersigned voters, earnestly petition for the passage by the United States Congress of the joint resolution introduced in the House of Representatives December 10, 1913, by Congressman RICHMOND P. HOBSON, and on the same day introduced in the Senate by Senator MORRIS SHEPPARD, providing for the prohibition of the sale, manufacture for sale, and exportation for sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes in the United States and all territory subject to the jurisdiction thereof.

C. R. SHEPHERD
(And others).

Voters of City of Attalla, State of Alabama.

Mr. WHITE. I also present resolutions from the members of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, in the city of Birmingham, Ala., which I ask to have read and properly referred.

There being no objection, the petition was read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolutions passed by the board of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, December 7, 1914.

In view of the fact that it is probable that national prohibition will be voted on in the National House of Representatives and the United States Senate at an early date, be it

Resolved, That the official board of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church, of Birmingham, Ala., heartily indorses national prohibition for the following reasons:

First. We think this the only means to successfully cope with this great evil.

Second. We feel that liquor is by far the greatest enemy of the home and church.

Third. We consider it the greatest enemy of legitimate business of all other lines of commerce. Be it

Further resolved, That these resolutions be inserted in the minutes and a copy be forwarded to each Representative from Alabama in the House and Senate, and that they be urged to support said bill or bills.

W. M. CORBY,
R. L. CASS,
J. L. TYLER,
Committee.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented petitions of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Takoma Park, D. C.; of the Highland Congregational Club, of Chesterfield, Mass.; of the Ministerial Association of Council Bluffs, Iowa; of International Order of Good Templars, of Mountain, N. Dak.; and of sundry citizens of Jefferson and Galveston, in the State of Texas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRISTOW presented petitions of sundry citizens of Kirwin, Topeka, Hays City, and Ford, all in the State of Kansas, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PITTMAN. I present a telegram in the nature of a petition from Mrs. E. W. Vendevender, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Reno, Nev., which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENO, NEV., December 13, 1914.

HON. KEY PITTMAN,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

One thousand votes in churches and Sunday schools of Reno for National Constitution prohibition amendment. Please inform Hon. FRANCIS G. NEWLANDS and Hon. E. E. ROBERTS.

Mrs. E. W. VENDEVENDER,
President Reno Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of State Council of Connecticut, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Stamford, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the official board of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church, and members of the Center Methodist Episcopal Church Sunday School; of Dristigheten Lodge, No. 11, International Order of Good Templars, Middletown; Svea Lodge, No. 52, International Order of Good Templars, of Branford; of Enighet Lodge, No. 42, International Order of Good Templars, of Manchester; of sundry citizens of Branford; of sundry citizens of Manchester; of Norden Lodge, No. 37, International Order of Good Templars, of New Britain; of the congregation of Union Plainfield Baptist Church, of Moosup; of sundry citizens of West Haven; of the congregation of First Methodist Episcopal Church of West Haven; of mem-